Cornelius Henrici Hoen (Honius) and his Epistle on the Eucharist (1525)

Medieval Heresy, Erasmian Humanism, and Reform in the Early Sixteenth-Century Low Countries

Bart Jan Spruyt

STUDIES IN MEDIEVAL AND REFORMATION TRADITIONS

BRILL

CORNELIUS HENRICI HOEN (HONIUS) AND HIS EPISTLE ON THE EUCHARIST (1525)

STUDIES IN MEDIEVAL AND REFORMATION TRADITIONS

History, Culture, Religion, Ideas

FOUNDED BY HEIKO A. OBERMAN †

EDITED BY

ANDREW COLIN GOW, Edmonton, Alberta

IN COOPERATION WITH

THOMAS A. BRADY, Jr., Berkeley, California
JOHANNES FRIED, Frankfurt
BRAD GREGORY, University of Notre Dame, Indiana
BERNDT HAMM, Erlangen
SUSAN C. KARANT-NUNN, Tucson, Arizona
JÜRGEN MIETHKE, Heidelberg
M. E. H. NICOLETTE MOUT, Leiden
GUSTAV HENNINGSEN, Copenhagen

VOLUME CXIX

B.J. SPRUYT

CORNELIUS HENRICI HOEN (HONIUS) AND HIS EPISTLE ON THE EUCHARIST (1525)

CORNELIUS HENRICI HOEN (HONIUS) AND HIS EPISTLE ON THE EUCHARIST (1525)

MEDIEVAL HERESY, ERASMIAN HUMANISM, AND REFORM IN THE EARLY SIXTEENTH-CENTURY LOW COUNTRIES

BY

BART JAN SPRUYT

BRILL

LEIDEN · BOSTON
2006

Cover illustration: a copy of the Schöffer-edition of Hoen's *Epistola christiana*, published in Worms in 1525.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Spruyt, Bart Jan.
Cornelius Henrici Hoen (Honius) and his epistle on the Eucharist (1525) / by Bart Jan Spruyt.
p. cm. — (Studies in medieval and Reformation traditions, ISSN 1573-4188 ; v. 119)
Originally presented as the author's thesis—University of Leiden, 1996.
Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.
ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15464-3 (alk. paper)
ISBN-10: 90-04-15464-7 (alk. paper)
1. Hoen, Cornelius Henrici, 1460?-1524 or 5. Epistola christiana admodum. 2. Lord's Supper—Real presence—History of doctrines—16th century. 3. Transubstantiation—History of doctrines—16th century. 4. Hoen, Cornelius Henrici, 1460?-1524 or 5. I. Title.

BV823.S67 2006
234'.163—dc22

2006050608

ISSN 1573-4188
ISBN-13: 978-90-04-15464-3
ISBN-10: 90-04-15464-7

© Copyright 2006 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing, IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Brill provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910 Danvers, MA 01923, USA.
Fees are subject to change

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

CONTENTS

List of abbreviations vii
Acknowledgements ix
Introduction xi

Chapter I. The Hoen problem: Albert Hardenberg's *Vita Wesseli Groningensis* and Cornelius Henrici Hoen's *fortuna critica* 1
1. The sources: from Albert Hardenberg to Martinus Schoockius 2
2. The debate between the Remonstrants and the Calvinists 9
3. Daniel Gerdes 19
4. The Nineteenth Century: Romanticism and Nationalism 21
5. Innovations and Consolidations: From J.G. de Hoop Scheffer and W. Moll to the Leiden Historical School 29
6. Recent Modifications and Re-Examinations 39

Chapter II. Hoen's life and its historical setting: his friends and his trial 43
1. Background and social standing 44
2. Humanism 47
3. Profession 55
4. Religious dissent: the Delft–The Hague circle 59
5. Trial 75

Chapter III. The *Epistola christiana admodum*: contents, sources and historical background 85
1. Contents 85
2. *Vt recitat Erasmus*: the relationship between Erasmus's *Annotationes in Nouum Testamentum* and Hoen's *Epistola* 99
3. The Decretals and the Roman Scholastics 107
4. *Annulus … mei amoris pignus*: Wessel Gansfort and Hoen's *Epistola* 115

5. The Eucharist as *pignus remissionis peccatorum*: the influence of Martin Luther 123
6. *Secundo l'opinione di Vichleff et di Berengario*: Wyclif, Hus and (late) medieval dissent 127
A. John Wyclif 129
B. Jan Hus 133
C. Berengar and the Cathars 137
D. *Les faulx hérites Praguois* in the fifteenth-century Low Countries 151

Chapter IV. The impact of Hoen's *Epistola christiana* 167
1. Printing history and translations 167
2. Hinne Rode's travels 187

Epilogue 219

APPENDICES

1. The Latin text of Hoen's *Epistola christiana* 225
2. The German translation of Hoen's *Epistola christiana* (Augsburg, 1526) 237

Bibliography 253
Index of personal names 285

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Allen	P.S. Allen *et al.*, edd., *Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, 12 vols. (Oxford, 1906–1958).
ARA	Algemeen Rijksarchief, 's-Gravenhage (General State Archives, The Hague).
BCor	*Correspondance de Martin Bucer*, Jean Rott, ed., vol. I–. SMRT, XXV– (Leiden, 1979–).
BH	Beroepen van het Hof van Holland (Appeals from the Court of Holland).
BLGNP	*Biografisch Lexicon voor de Geschiedenis van het Nederlandse Protestantisme*, six volumes (Kampen, 1978–2006)
BRN	*Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica*, F. Pijper and S. Cramer, edd. ('s-Gravenhage, 1903–1914).
C	Codex Justinianus.
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis (Turnhout, 1962–).
CCL	Corpus Christianorum Latinorum (Turnhout, 1953–).
CSEL	Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum (Vienna, 1866–).
D	Digests.
Duke	Alastair Duke, *Reformation and Revolt in the Low Countries* (London–Ronceverte, 1990).
Ep.	[Cornelius Henrici Hoen,] *Epistola christiana admodum…*, below, appendix 1, pp. 226–235.
Fredericq	Paul Fredericq, ed., *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis haereticae pravitatis Neerlandicae*, 5 vols. (Gent–'s-Gravenhage, 1899–1902).
Friedberg	*Corpus Iuris Canonici*, Aemilius Friedberg, ed., 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1879; repr. Graz, 1959).
I	Institutes of Justinianus.
LB	*Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami Opera Omnia emendatiora et auctiora*, 10 vols. (Leiden, 1703–1706; repr. Hildesheim, 1961–1962).
Lombard	Petrus Lombardus, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, 2 vols. Spicilegium Bonaventurianum, 4–5 (Rome, 1971–1981).

MBDS	Martin Bucer, *Deutsche Schriften*, Robert Stupperich *et al.*, edd., Vol. I– (Gütersloh–Paris, 1960–).
MPG	*Patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca*, J.-P. Migne, ed., 162 vols. (Paris, 1857–1866).
MPL	*Patrologiae cursus completus, series latina*, J.-P. Migne, ed., 221 vols. (Paris, 1844–1864).
(N)AGN	*Algemene geschiedenis der Nederlanden*, D.P. Blok *et al.*, edd., 15 vols. (Haarlem, 1977–1983).
NAK	*Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis*.
NK-W.	Nijhoff and M.E. Kronenberg, *Nederlandsche bibliografie van 1500 tot 1540*, 3 vols. (The Hague, 1923–1971).
NNBW	*Nieuw Nederlandsch biografisch woordenboek*, P.C. Molhuysen and Fr.K.H. Kossmann, edd., 10 vols. (Leiden, 1911–1937).
SMRT	Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought.
StA	*Martin Luther Studienausgabe*, Hans-Ulrich Delius *et al.*, edd., vol. I– (Berlin, 1979–).
VD16	*Verzeichnis der im deutschen Sprachbereich erschienenen Drucke des XVI. Jahrhunderts–VD 16-*. Herausgegeben von der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek in München in Verbindung mit der Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel, vol. I– (Stuttgart, 1983–).
WA	*Luthers Werke. Kritische Gesamtausgabe [Abteilung Schriften]* (Weimar–Graz, 1883–1983).
WA BR	*Luthers Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe. Briefwechsel*, 15 vols. (Weimar, 1930–1980).
X	*Decretales Gregorii IX* (Friedberg II, pp. 1–928).
Z	*Huldreich Zwinglis sämtliche Werke*, I–. Corpus Reformatorum 88– (Leipzig–Zürich, 1905–).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book was defended as a dissertation at the University of Leiden on 21 February 1996. The research for the thesis was done at the Leiden Faculty of Theology during the years 1991–1994, and my work was supported by the Dutch Organization for Scientific Research (Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek). However, publication has been delayed for an embarrassing number of years.

The late Professor Heiko A. Oberman (then Professor of History at the University of Arizona in Tucson) first urged me to write a thesis, and generously granted it a place in his series of Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought (Traditions). I would like to dedicate the publication of this book to his cherished memory.

I also want to express my gratitude both to my promoter, Professor G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes, for his careful supervision, and to the editor of this series, Professor M.E.H.N. Mout, for her courteous and subsequently irresistible request that I prepare the thesis for publication.

My greatest debt—and the one most eagerly acknowledged—is due to Professor J. Trapman, who, in spite of his unofficial role, over the years has granted me the benefit of his extensive knowledge of the early Dutch reformation in general and Hoen's letter in particular, and, moreover, of his erudition, attention and advice.

My research reached a decisive turning point at the conference on medieval heresy and literacy at Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford, in July 1992. There, I had the opportunity to present my tentative conclusions about the medieval background of Hoen's treatise, and I recall gratefully the discussions I had with professors Anne Hudson, Gary Macy, Alexander Patchovsky, Frantisek Smahel and Gabriel Audisio.

The Hague, January 2006
Bart Jan Spruyt

INTRODUCTION

This book is about Cornelius Henrici (Cornelis Hendricxz.) Hoen and his well-known treatise on the Eucharist, published in 1525. Hoen—a key figure in the history of Christian humanism in the early sixteenth-century Low Countries—appears in virtually all books on Reformation history. The reason for this is not hard to ascertain. His pamphlet, assumed to have been edited by the Swiss reformer Ulrich Zwingli, is generally regarded as one of the main sources of the reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper. However, despite his apparent importance, a separate study of Hoen has been lacking, and I have tried to fill the gap with this book. I have sought answers to questions such as, Who was Hoen? What made him dissent from the current belief in transubstantiation? How influential has his treatise been?

After a detailed overview of Hoen's *fortuna critica* in the first chapter, the second chapter looks at Hoen's life. Though the available evidence remains scanty, some new sources allow for a more detailed portrait than previously. Born towards the middle of the fifteenth century, Hoen studied law in Louvain and became a lawyer to the Court of Holland in The Hague. There he joined a group of colleagues that supported Erasmus's pleas for spiritual and ecclesiastical renewal. Though the humanistic method was to remain unimportant for his juridical argumentation, Erasmus's philological approach to the text of the Bible was one of the most significant spurs to Hoen's deviation from established church doctrine. Suspected (not incorrectly) of Lutheran sympathies, Hoen ran foul of the Inquisition, was arrested, and died in conditional liberty within The Hague during the winter of 1524–1525.

New sources have also made it possible to sketch his trial in more detail. They show why his became a famous case, one which forced the Emperor Charles V to desist from efforts to create a tribunal specifically for prosecuting heresy.

The contents and sources of Hoen's ideas are discussed in the third chapter. It shows his dependence on Erasmus and Luther, but also focuses on a detailed discussion of the historical background to his most personal ideas: his use of Mt 24,23 as an argument against transub-

stantiation; his interpretation of *est* as *significat* in the words of institution (*hoc est corpus meum*); his notion of the sacrament as an effective sign; his critique of alleged miracles, and his periodization of church history. A search for the historical roots of these ideas leads to the conclusion that Hoen revived age-old 'heretical' arguments, first proposed by Berengar in the eleventh century and adopted by the Cathars (and which thus found their way into the scholastic defences of orthodoxy). These arguments were continued by Wyclif and Hus and popularized and radicalized by the Lollards and the Hussites, among other places in the late medieval Burgundian Netherlands. Hoen's treatise appears to create a focal point for these old, dissenting traditions. This conclusion also suggests that Hoen's pamphlet was in fact an adaptation, with several significant interpolations, of a mysterious, two-hundred-year-old *vetus scriptum* mentioned in Albert Hardenberg's *Vita Wesseli Groningensis*.

The final chapter discusses the dissemination of Hoen's epistle. Within two years (1525–1526) the text saw two Latin and three German editions. Hoen's friend, Rector Hinne Rode of the Utrecht Brotherhouse, took the manuscript to several centres of the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland, namely Wittenberg, Basel, Zurich and Strasbourg. Luther is known to have rejected it, but the text provided Andreas Karlstadt with arguments which became the basis for the first rift between the Reformers on the doctrine of the Eucharist.

While it is hard to establish Hoen's probable influence on Oecolampadius, Zwingli welcomed Hoen's significative interpretation of the words of institution as a "great pearl". It helped Zwingli to clarify his own still-vague notions of a spiritualist interpretation of the sacrament. At the same time, however, Zwingli developed more radical views than Hoen. This becomes evident from a comparison of the different ways in which Hoen and Zwingli used the metaphor of the ring. Neither was Zwingli the editor of Hoen's treatise. The Latin text was edited by Peter Schöffer in Worms and by Johann Knobloch in Strasbourg, but not by Christoph Frohschauer in Zurich. In Strasbourg Hinne Rode was received cordially by Martin Bucer. From Hoen's treatise Bucer adopted the commemorative interpretation of the Eucharist, accepting Hoen's appeal to Mt 24,23 and his ideas about the nature of biblical miracles.

Hoen's treatise thus played a significant role in the first debates on the Eucharist between Wittenberg and Zurich. It supplied Karlstadt with arguments which led to his breach with Luther and his expulsion from Saxony. The treatises Karlstadt wrote next (in the autumn of

1524) provoked Luther's anger, but eventually convinced the Zurich and Strasbourg reformers of the correctness of some of his arguments. Together, Karlstadt's treatise and Hoen's letter helped them to clarify their more symbolic, commemorative and significative interpretation of the Eucharist, which proved of lasting importance for the reformed tradition.

In view of the repetition of several of Hoen's arguments (*viz.* the appeal to Mt 24,23 and the use of the metaphor of the ring) in the thought of the notorious Anabaptist Melchior Hoffman, the epistle not only establishes the continuity between (late) medieval dissent and the early Reformation, but also between the early and the radical Reformation. Hoen's thought proves to be a classic example of the "continuity-in-mutability" which the learned Oxford don C.S. Lewis thought the mode of all life.

CHAPTER ONE

THE HOEN PROBLEM: ALBERT HARDENBERG'S *VITA WESSELI GRONINGENSIS* AND CORNELIUS HENRICI HOEN'S *FORTUNA CRITICA*

Until the modern era of detached and scholarly study of the history of Christianity, the history of the church was primarily treated as an arsenal from which the different ecclesiastical denominations obtained their polemical weaponry. Representatives of the early Reformation did not escape this fate; they too were used by church historians to bolster their claims to the truth and antiquity of their views. As the need arose, the early Reformation in the Netherlands was a mirror in which the viewer saw reflected his own image. A pervasive programme of historical self-legitimation was orchestrated around this period, including one of its main figures, Cornelis Henricxz. Hoen. Up to 1600 little was known about him, and hardly any new information has come to light since then. The few surviving facts about Hoen and his treatise against transubstantiation were established by about 1600, and the ensuing ages added nothing of importance. The well-known facts served merely as polemical fodder.[1]

Significantly, the first attempts to describe this period arose in the wake of the conflict between Calvinists and Remonstrants in the early seventeenth century. Before discussing their conceptions of the early

[1] For a survey of the historiography of the Dutch Reformation, see D. Nauta, 'De Reformatie in Nederland in de historiografie', in P.M.A. Geurts and A.E.M. Janssen, edd., *Geschiedschrijving in Nederland* II: *Geschiedbeoefening* (The Hague, 1981), pp. 206–227; J.C.H. Blom and C.J. Misset, '"Een onvervalschte Nederlandsche geest": enkele historiografische kanttekeningen bij het concept van een nationaal-gereformeerde richting', in E.K. Grootes and J. den Haan, edd., *Geschiedenis, godsdienst, letterkunde: opstellen aangeboden aan dr. S.B.J. Zilverberg* (Roden, 1989), pp. 221–232. See Alastair Duke for a brief but detailed study, 'The Origins of Evangelical Dissent in the Low Countries', in Duke, pp. 1–28, at pp. 1–8. Biographical and bibliographical information concerning the historians discussed here can be found in E.O.G. Haitsma Mulier and G.A.C. van der Lem, edd., *Repertorium van geschiedschrijvers in Nederland, 1500–1800*. Bibliografische reeks van het Nederlands Historisch Genootschap, 7 (The Hague, 1990). Christiaan Sepp, *Bibliotheek van Nederlandsche kerkgeschiedschrijvers* (Leiden, 1886) remains required reading.

Reformation and examining the place they allotted to Hoen, we need to trace which facts about Hoen—other than his own Letter on the Eucharist—these historicizing theologians had at their disposal.

1. *The sources: from Albert Hardenberg to Martinus Schoockius*

The most important among their sources was the *Vita Wesseli Groningensis* of Albert Hardenberg (Albert Modenkar of Hardenberg, ca. 1510–1574). This work remained in manuscript form during Hardenberg's life, but in 1614 the editors of Wessel's *Opera* included it in their edition.[2] The *Vita* is in fact the first extensive document which not only treats of the early Reformation in the Low Countries but which also discusses Hoen's role.

From 1517 to 1527, Hardenberg attended the school of the Brethren of the Common Life in Groningen, where the rector was Goswin of Halen. He then spent three years in the famous Cistercian monastery of Aduard, where he studied under Abbot Johannes Reekamp. In 1530 he moved to Louvain, where the writings of Erasmus led him to become a 'biblical humanist'. He left Louvain in August 1538, with the plan of going to Italy. Illness, however, kept him in Mainz, where he continued his studies and was promoted *doctor bullatus* in 1539. Here he also developed pronounced sympathies for the Reformation. That same year he returned to Louvain, where he became a member of reform-minded conventicles and soon openly expounded the reformed doctrine of justification. But he also ran foul of the Inquisition and was condemned. For the next two years he took refuge in Aduard, where Reekamp asked him to preach and teach. In his *Historia de statu Belgico deque religione Hispanica*, the Spanish humanist Francisco de Enzinas relates how he and Melanchthon tried to convince Hardenberg that his choice of a comfortable life, hidden in his monastery, demonstrated a lack of faith.[3]

---

[2] Wessel Gansfort, *Opera* (Groningen, 1614; repr. Nieuwkoop, 1966), **—***2verso. Hardenberg's manuscript is preserved in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich, Cod. lat. 10351, fol. 14recto–18verso. The variants between Hardenberg's autograph and the printed version are described by Maarten van Rhijn, *Wessel Gansfort* (The Hague, 1917), appendix A, pp. xii–xiv. Van Rhijn's list of Hardenberg's erroneous statements (pp. xiv–xxiii) requires the correction that Hardenberg clearly spelled Hoen's name as *Hon*ius and not, as Van Rhijn read (p. xviii), *Hov*ius.

[3] See Franciscus Enzinas, *Historia de statu Belgico deque religione Hispanica*, Franciscus Socas, ed. (Stuttgart–Leipzig, 1991), p. 4.

Persuaded, Hardenberg decided to embrace the Reformation and in 1542 left Aduard, to matriculate in Wittenberg the next year.[4]

Hardenberg was thus brought up in the typical climate that had dominated the spiritual life of the northern Netherlands and the neighbouring German lands since the late fifteenth century. From 1449–1485, while Henry of Rees was its abbot, Aduard became a focal point for this spiritual development and a place where various scholars regularly met for discussion.[5] The most famous visitors were Rudolph Agricola and Wessel Gansfort.[6] The memories of this era were kept alive by Goswin of Halen (ca. 1468–1530) who, as rector of the school in Groningen, directed Hardenberg's initial studies and afterwards stayed in contact with his former pupil.[7] Van Halen, who had been their *famulus*, wrote a *Vita* of both Agricola and Gansfort.[8] The rector so influenced his pupil that Hardenberg later sought to gather all of Wessel's writings in order

---

[4] See Wim Janse, *Albert Hardenberg als Theologe: Profil eines Bucer-schülers*, SHCT, 57 (Leiden, 1994), pp. 5–113. In 1544 Hardenberg joined the service of Herman von Wied who sought to reform the archbishopric of Cologne. In 1547 he was army chaplain to Count Christoph of Oldenburg and after the liberation of Bremen, Oldenburg made him the preacher of the cathedral. As a result of his quarrel with the Lutheran Johann Timann concerning the Lord's Supper, Hardenberg was forced to leave Bremen in 1561. After a brief period as a wandering preacher in the southern Low Countries he found asylum in Rastede, a monastery near Oldenburg. From 1565 to 1567 he was the pastor of Sengwerden and from October 1567 until his death in 1574, he was *pastor primarius* in Emden.

[5] P.S. Allen, *The Age of Erasmus* (Oxford, 1914), pp. 7–32; F. Akkerman and C.G. Santing, 'Rudolf Agricola en de Aduarder academie', *Groningse Volksalmanak*, 1987, pp. 6–28.

[6] In a letter to Johannes Reuchlin, Agricola wrote that he was very close to Gansfort ("fuit mihi arctissima cum eo familiaritas") and that Wessel had urged him to study the *sacrae litterae*: "statui enim senectutis requiem (si modo ea me manet) in sacrarum literarum perquisitionem collocare […] Basilius quoque […] acriter me incitauit, secutus tamen fortasse impetum meum et calcaria (vt dicitur) currenti subdens". Rodolphus Agricola, *De inventione dialectica. Lucubrationes*, Alardus Aemstelredamus, ed. (Cologne, 1539; repr. Nieuwkoop, 1967), II, p. 180.

[7] M. van Rhijn, 'Goswinus van Halen', in Van Rhijn, *Studiën over Wessel Gansfort en zijn tijd* (Utrecht, 1933), pp. 137–159.

[8] I.B. Kan, *Wesseli Groningensis, Rodolphi Agricolae, Erasmi Roterodami vitae ex codice Vindobonensi typis descriptae*, in *Erasmiani Gymnasii programma litterarium* (Rotterdam, 1894); I.B. Kan, 'Nieuwe levensberichten van Wessel Gansfort en Rudolph Agricola, medegedeeld uit een Weener H.S.', *Groningsche volksalmanak voor het jaar 1899* (Groningen, 1898), pp. 63–83. See also H.E.J.M. van der Velden, *Rodolphus Agricola (Roelof Huusman), een Nederlandsche humanist der vijftiende eeuw* (Leiden, s.a.), p. 17; Maarten van Rhijn, *Wessel Gansfort*, appendix A, pp. iii–vi; James Michael Weiss, 'The Six Lives of Rudolph Agricola: Forms and Functions of Humanist Biography', *Humanistica Lovaniensa* 30 (1981) 19–39, at pp. 24–27.

to publish them, and to learn what he could about his life. In the quiet of Rastede (1563–1565) he found the leisure to turn his many notes into his *Vita Wesseli*. These notes contain a passage that is always quoted in the literature about Hoen.

After quoting a letter of Luther's from 1522 and three letters from Goswin of Halen to Hardenberg himself,[9] the *Vita* takes an unexpected turn: Hardenberg cites the documents not just for the valuable information they contain about Wessel, but also to show his opponents which studies he, Hardenberg, pursued during his youth.[10] Hardenberg then cites published testimonies about Wessel,[11] continuing with a "most honourable testimony", namely a letter from the Basel printer Adam Petri to Conrad Faber.[12] This insertion illustrates not only Wessel's biography but that of Hardenberg as well. He uses the letters of Luther and Petri to describe the polemics on the Lord's Supper, which also affected him adversely. In this context he produced the passage on Hoen.[13]

Hardenberg remembers having heard that "Cornelius Honius, member of the Court of Emperor Charles in The Hague and some other learned men" had found an old treatise on the Lord's Supper (*vetus quoddam scriptum de caena Domini*) which seemed to condemn the gross 'Capernaitic'[14] eating of the body of Christ and which instead interpreted 'eating' as spiritual (*manducatio spiritualis*). They had found this text among the papers of Doctor Jacobus Hoeck, dean of Naaldwijk, together with writings by Wessel on purgatory and other theological

---

[9] For Luther's letter (originally published in an edition of Wessel's *Epistolae*, printed by Simon Corver in Zwolle in 1522), see WA 10/II, pp. 311–317; Goswin's three letters survive only in Hardenberg's *Vita*.

[10] *Vita Wesseli Groningensis*, **5verso ("vt mei aduersarii videant quod fuerit studium adolescentiae meae").

[11] *Vita Wesseli Groningensis*, **5verso–**6recto. The Chronicle of Ursperg is *Paralipomena a Friderico II usque ad Carolum quintum Augustum, hoc est, rerum memorabilium ab anno 1230 vsque ad annum 1537, ex probatioribus qui habentur scriptoribus in arctum coacta, et historiae abbatis Urspergensis per quendam studiosum [Kaspar Hedio] annexa*; see VD 16, H 932–934.

[12] This letter, edited by Ulrich Hugwald, follows Petri's edition of Wessel's *Farrago* that he printed in September 1522 and January 1523.

[13] *Vita Wesseli Groningensis*, **6verso: "Sunt duae hic iam adscriptae epistolae, altera Lutheri, altera huius Adami Petri, de quibus nunc referam, quod me audiuisse memini, quoniam aliquid attinet ad controversiam quae grassatur circa sacramentum eucharistiae hoc etiam nunc tempore et quae me circulo Saxonico proscripsit."

[14] The word 'Capernaitic' (cf. Io 6,52) in the sixteenth century developed into a controversial designation for the belief in transubstantiation; see *The Oxford English Dictionary* (2nd ed., Oxford, 1989), II, pp. 860–861, *s.v.* 'Capernaite' (quoting examples from 1549 to 1661).

topics. Jacobus Hoeck was the uncle of Martinus Dorpius, professor of theology in Louvain. Since it was found among Wessel's writings, Hoen and his friends assumed that Wessel had also written the treatise on the Eucharist. Hardenberg could neither reject nor affirm this, but argued that Wessel had thought and written about the Eucharist in nearly the same manner. He added, however, that the treatise was very old and that it had circulated among learned men for more than two hundred years. Those who found it valued it as a great treasure, believing they could eradicate the entire papal superstition concerning the Eucharist with its help. In addition to the treatise, they found more of Gansfort's writings, some among Hoeck's books and some at Mount St Agnes, the cloister of Regular Canons where Wessel usually spent part of the year. Hoen and his friends convinced Henricus Rhodius, rector of the Utrecht Brotherhouse, to take all these works, together with the treatise on the Eucharist, to Luther for his approval. Luther, "fearing any profanation of the Lord's Supper", rejected them. During a meal in Wittenberg, Andreas Karlstadt pressed Luther to reconsider and approve them, and to write against the doctrine of "carnal eating". When Luther refused, Karlstadt said that he himself, although less competent, would do so. Luther threw him a golden coin and said Karlstadt could keep it if he really dared to write against "carnal eating". Karlstadt accepted the challenge and subsequently developed the thesis that when Christ said *Hoc est corpus meum* he pointed to his own body. Thus Karlstadt gave Luther the opportunity to combat "this absurd and dangerous interpretation".

Before continuing his description of Rode's travels, Hardenberg remarks that he learned of these events from Melanchthon and Thomas Blaurer. The latter had been present during the quarrel as a guest in Luther's house and on his deathbed he told Hardenberg what had occurred between Luther and Karlstadt. This led Hardenberg to the conclusion that the controversies about the Lord's Supper originated in Wittenberg, not in Zurich or in Basel.

In spite of his rejection, Hardenberg continues, Luther wrote a letter for Rhodius which was later published as a preface to Wessel's works. In addition, he gave him a letter addressed to Oecolampadius, asking him for his opinion on the old treatise and encouraging him to have Wessel's writings printed in Basel. But when the modest and bashful Oecolampadius learned that Luther had rejected the treatise, he was afraid to express his views and sent it on to Zwingli. Since Zwingli had already reached a similar opinion on different grounds, he approved

the thesis and, after having consulted many doctors of theology, began to defend it. Soon after, Oecolampadius also formed a more definite opinion. This did not please Luther in the least and thus the troubles started.

Rode, sent to Zurich by Oecolampadius, left Wessel's writings with his host. At first it was rumoured that Oecolampadius had been so angered by their content that he had burned them. Later rumours speculated that they had been bought by an unknown person and given to Adam Petri, who then printed them. Rode, who had meanwhile returned to the Low Countries, was uncertain about the fate of Wessel's writings. But with the aid of others, he saw to it that they, together with Wessel's treatise *De passione Domini*, were published in Zwolle.

As witnesses who could testify to the veracity of his story, Hardenberg cited Van Halen, Melanchthon and Blaurer, as well as Rode himself. Hardenberg also described the latter's death and funeral.[15]

Later historians were able to add to this description the information which Ludovicus Lavater provided in his widely known *Historia de origine et progressu controuersiae sacramentariae de coena Domini* (1563). Lavater began his historical survey with the statement that from 1524 Zwingli had begun to oppose the existing eucharistic conventions. Rejecting the doctrines of transubstantiation and consubstantiation, Zwingli had maintained that the body and blood of Christ were received "spiritually, not corporeally, not by mouth but by the human spirit and by faith". He interpreted the words *Hoc est corpus meum* tropically, but only after he had carefully studied the "old books on the Eucharist" and after "Iohannes Rhodius and Georgius Saganus" had given him a letter from Hoen.[16] The same information could be found in another commonly

[15] *Vita Wesseli Groningensis*, **6verso–**7verso.

[16] Ludovicus Lavater, *Historia de origine et progressu controuersiae sacramentariae de coena Domini, ab anno natiuitatis Christi MDXXIIII vsque ad annum MDLXIII deducta* (Zurich, 1563), A1recto–A1verso: "Factum quoque est, vt Iohannes Rhodius et Georgius Saganus, pii et docti viri, Tigurum venirent vt de eucharistia cum Zwinglio conferrent. Qui, cum eius sententiam audiuissent, dissimulantes suam, gratia egerunt Deo quod a tanto errore liberati essent atque Honii Batavi epistolam protulerunt, in qua *est* in verbis institutionis coenae Domini per *significat* explicatur, quae interpretatio Zwinglio commodissime videbatur". In the second edition of this work (Zurich, 1572) this passage is repeated verbatim on p. A2recto. Lavater copied this information from Zwingli's *Amica exegesis* (February 1527) and thus is not an independent witness: see Otto Clemen, 'Hinne Rode in Wittenberg, Basel, Zürich und die frühesten Ausgaben Wesselscher Schriften', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 18 (1898) 346–372, at pp. 347–348.

used reference book on the controversies concerning the Lord's Supper, the *Historia sacramentaria* of Rudolphus Hospinianus.[17]

In addition to the *Vita* by Hardenberg and these surveys of the eucharistic controversies, two lesser-known sources deserve special attention because they contain significant information on the early Reformation in the Netherlands as well as on Hoen. The first of these is Henricus Antonides Nerdenus's *Praefatio* to his *Systema theologicum* (1611), a collection of student disputations chaired by the Franeker Professor of Theology.[18] This preface is one of the primary sources for our knowledge of the early Reformation.[19] After providing a survey of the Ref-

[17] Rudolphus Hospinianus, *Historia sacramentaria, hoc est libri quinque de coenae Dominicae prima institutione eiusque vero vsu et abusu* (Zurich, 1598). On Hospinianus's dependence on the work of Lavater see Walther Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther: Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl nach seinen politischen und religiösen Beziehungen* I: *Die religiöse und politische Entwicklung bis zum Marburger Religionsgespräch 1529*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte, 6 (Leipzig, l924), p. 8, n. 3.

[18] *Systema theologicum disputationibus publicis propositum in Academia Franequerensi, praeside Henrico Antonii Nerdeno* (Franeker, 1611), A2recto–E1recto: *Praefatio dedicatoria in qua et purioris religionis per Belgium instauratae historia et eius retinendae necessitas exponitur*. Three copies of this work survive: one is in the Provincial Library of Friesland in Leeuwarden (shelf mark: 811 Godg.) and one in the library of the Remonstrant Church of Rotterdam (now in the University Library, Leiden, shelf mark: Sem.Rem. 5216). See J.I. Doedes, 'De buitengewone lotgevallen van het bericht, door Henricus Antonides Nerdenus aangaande het begin der Hervorming in Nederland gegeven, in zijne *Praefatio* voor zijn *Systema theologicum* (1611)', *Godgeleerde bijdragen* 43 (1869) 289–304 and J.I. Doedes, 'Een tweede exemplaar van het *Systema theologicum* van Henricus Antonides', *Bibliographische adversaria* 1 (1873–1874) 77–79; *Catalogus van de Remonstrantsch-Gereformeerde Gemeente te Rotterdam* (The Hague, 1893), p. 174. The third copy is in the Bodleian Library in Oxford, shelf mark: F.F.32. Th. Daniel Gerdes published the historical part of the *Praefatio* under the title *Aurora Euangelii restaurati in ecclesiis Belgicis ex H. Antonidis Epistola ad Ordines Belgii* in the *Miscellanea Groningana* III/1 (Groningen, 1740), pp. 43–57. Nerdenus's *Systema* had already become so rare that Gerdes had to base his edition on a manuscript of Henricus Alting provided by Councillor Hendrik Hofsnider from his library. According to his letter to E.L. Vriemoet of 16 October 1746, Gerdes did not obtain a copy of the *Systema* until that year. The letter is in the University Library of Groningen; see K.M. Witteveen, *Daniel Gerdes* (Groningen, l963), pp. 220, 253. Witteveen erroneously assumes that Gerdes's edition was based on the printed text and did not notice the misprint of the date as 1613 instead of 1611. See also [Daniel Gerdes,] *Florilegium historico-criticum librorum rariorum* (Groningen and Bremen, 1763), pp. 22–25. J.G. de Hoop Scheffer published a Dutch translation of the historical part in *De Navorscher* 17 (1867) 353–360.

[19] J.G. de Hoop Scheffer in *De Navorscher* 17 (1867), pp. 354–355, noticed that Nerdenus's dedicatory preface contained "several very remarkable pages", in which particulars are given about the beginning of the Reformation in the Netherlands "which cannot be found in any other writer from his or earlier times". The dedication belongs therefore "to the sources of our history of that era".

ormation elsewhere in Europe, Nerdenus discusses the emergence of Luther's influence in the Low Countries. He says that Hoen taught the true doctrine of the Gospels in Delft, interpreting the words of institution tropically. Nerdenus added the names of Hoen's friends and briefly mentioned Rode's travels abroad.[20]

Martinus Schoockius (1614–1669) is the second important source author. This controversial scholar dedicated the seventh chapter of his *Liber de bonis vulgo ecclesiasticis dictis* (1651) to the history of the Reformation as it spread after Luther's first reforms to all the provinces of the Low Countries.[21] He presented his material in geographical order, and on the title-page described the historical part of his book as a "sample of a more extensive work". In other places he called it nothing more than an *index*, a prelude to a larger work that he promised to write, but never did.[22] This is all the more regrettable as Schoockius had at his disposal a large number of important documents that he also promised to publish. The hope that his papers will ever be found again at this date is rather slim.[23] But what he included deserves our attention all the more.

Schoockius relates that Luther's efforts found followers and imitators in the Low Countries, where the Reformation had already been

---

[20] *Systema theologicum*, B1verso–B2recto: "Praefectus collegii Hieronymiani Trajecti Iohannes Rhodius euangelium recipit et quia Evangelicis in Germania de re sacramentaria minus conueniebat, ad eos saepe excurrit. Basiliaeae loquutus est Oecolampadio anno 1523 in Ianuario. Cornelius Honius, doctissimus iureconsultus, purum euangelium profitetur Delphis, et in propositione *Hoc est corpus meum* in coena sacra copulam *est* ad imitationem veterum et scripturae analogiam interpretatur per *significat*. Hanc suam interpretationem anno 1523 communicat per Rhodium et Georgium Sylvanum cum Luthero, Oecolampadio, Zuinglio, his astipulantibus, illo non. Honio se adiungunt Gnaphaeus Hagensis et eius scholae Rector, Ioannes Pistorius, sacris contra animi sententiam initiatus Woerdae, et Ioannes Sartorius Noortuicensis et eius loci Rector, Bernardus monachus, Gerardus Wormerus, Gulielmus Trajectinus."

[21] Martinus Schoockius, *Liber de bonis vulgo ecclesiatiscis dictis* (Groningen, 1651), pp. 437–529. See also Christiaan Sepp, *Bibliotheek van Nederlandsche kerkgeschiedschrijvers*, p. 211: "The facts recorded by Schoock are undoubtedly more significant than the information supplied by Nerdenus. They remain valuable as a source for our knowledge and as a repository of basic information for our research."

[22] *Liber de bonis ecclesiasticis*, p. 514.

[23] Schoockius mentions *sparsim* unprinted documents (in particular materials written by Ioannes Sartorius) which he possessed; see for example pp. 453, 460, 476, 479, 485, 486. For the frustrated attempts to discover these papers, see De Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland van haar ontstaan tot 1531* (Amsterdam, 1873), pp. 62–63; Van Rhijn, *Wessel Gansfort*, appendix C, pp. lv–lvi; D.P. Oosterbaan, 'School en kerk in het Middeleeuwse Delft (II)', *Spiegel der Historie* 1 (1966) 111–118, at p. 118, note 86; D.P. Oosterbaan, *De Oude Kerk te Delft gedurende de Middeleeuwen* (The Hague, 1973), p. 234 and p. 273, note 173.

prepared for by theologians such as Wessel Gansfort. He describes the Reformation's breakthrough in the different regions and cities, gives brief sketches of the leading figures and records their writings. When discussing developments in Delft, he states that an ecclesiastical congregation had already come into being in 1522 through the influence of a former Dominican monk. As members of this circle Schoockius lists Georgius Sylvanus, Ioannes Sartorius and *e politicis* Cornelius Honius, a most learned jurist. These were joined by Ioannes Pistorius, the first martyr of Holland, and Gulielmus Gnapheus, rector of the Latin school in The Hague. Schoockius called Hoen one of the first who understood the mystery of the Eucharist in an orthodox sense.[24] In his discussion of the Reformation in The Hague, Schoockius highlighted the roles played by Pistorius, Gnapheus and Hoen. Pistorius, a pupil of Ioannes Rhodius, was burned in 1525, not yet twenty-eight years old.[25] Although Gnapheus was not martyred, he was imprisoned with Pistorius and proved himself steadfast. Gnapheus not only described the martyrdom of Pistorius but also wrote other useful books.[26] Hoen was Gnapheus's companion; he had been in prison with Gnapheus but was released conditionally and died soon after.[27]

2. *The debate between the Remonstrants and the Calvinists*

When the movements of the Remonstrants and the Counter-Remonstrants emerged within the bosom of the Dutch reformed churches, the original character of religious, reform-minded dissent in the Netherlands became an important ecclesiastical—and therefore political—issue. Although the controversies between the Remonstrants and the Counter-Remonstrants began as a doctrinal polemic, and came to focus on the authority of confessional writings and the relationship

[24] *Liber de bonis ecclesiasticis*, p. 479.

[25] *Liber de bonis ecclesiasticis*, pp. 487–488. Schoockius also reported on Rode's journey to Luther and others, for which he relied on Hardenberg's *Vita*; *Liber de bonis ecclesiasticis*, pp. 497–499.

[26] *Liber de bonis ecclesiasticis*, p. 488. On pp. 526 and 528 Schoockius mentions the *T'samenspraecke tusschen Tobiam en Lazarum*, the *Acolastus* and a tragi-comedy entitled *Hypocrisin*.

[27] *Liber de bonis ecclesiasticis*, p. 488: "Gnaphaeo suppar Cornelius Honius, vir doctissimus et senator integerrimus, qui cum Gnaphaeo primitus in carcerem coniectus et postea ea lege interposita cautione dismissus, alio ne commigraret, priusquam libertati suae restitutus esset, pie in Domino obdormiuit."

between church and state, a contrasting view of the Reformation of the church underlay the clash. The Remonstrants, in the tradition of irenicism, interpreted 'reformation' primarily as a reform of organizational and moral abuses rather than as a thorough redefinition of doctrine (regarding many of the points at issue in the seventeenth century as *adiaphora*). Their opponents perceived 'reformation' first and foremost as a doctrinal reformation which took the form of a finely spun definition of the new teachings; they also stressed the importance of a tight ecclesiastical organization with rigid discipline. The Remonstrants saw this demand for discipline as a reintroduction of 'papal' tyranny.[28] The conflict between the two parties became increasingly sharp after 1610, when the religious polemics became a political debate. As is well-known, the struggle between the two parties was decided at the Synod of Dordt (1618–1619), in favour of the Calvinists. In the preface to the *Acta* of this synod it was stated that Dordt had vindicated and safeguarded the original character of the Dutch Reformation. According to this preface, the views of the Remonstrants had not emerged until the second half of the sixteenth century with the activities of Caspar Coolhaes, Herman Wiggertsz, Herman Herbertsz and Jacobus Arminius; it was their teachings which had caused the religious troubles.[29] Just as

[28] Geraerdt Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie en andre kerkelyke geschiedenissen in en ontrent de Nederlanden* I (Amsterdam, 1671), pp. 551–552, formulated the distinction clearly: the *politijken* (William of Orange and the States of Holland) followed the "many pious and learned" who "for more than a hundred years" had first sought a "Reformation or improvement and restoration of conditions, without tying themselves to an opinion about particular subjects on which those doctors who favored a Reformation disagreed among themselves". They saw 'reformation' as "the worship of God, cleansed from gross abuses but without a narrow definition of the doctrinal points of dispute". On the other hand, the ministers, who borrowed their views from "the books of Calvin and some others who strongly promoted their own opinions", did everything to win the acceptance of the "opinions" of Calvin and their teachers as authoritative, and unlike the "politiques" they did not work towards "accommodation and reasonable tolerance", but insisted on "decision and definition". On the conflict between the Remonstrants and the Calvinists and its consequences for historiography, see G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes, 'De doorwerking van de Moderne Devotie, met name bij de Remonstranten', in P. Bange *et alii*, edd., *De doorwerking van de Moderne Devotie: Windesheim, 1387–1987* (Hilversum, 1988), pp. 81–94; B.J. Spruyt, 'Martin Bucers *Gulden Brief*: de irenische Bucer in de polemiek tussen Remonstranten en Contra-Remonstranten', in F. van der Pol, ed., *Bucer en de kerk* (Kampen, 1992), pp. 84–174; J. Trapman, 'Grotius and Erasmus' in H.J.M. Nellen and E. Rabbie, edd., *Hugo Grotius Theologian. Essays in Honour of G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes*. SHCT, 55 (Leiden, 1994), pp. 77–98.

[29] The relevant passage from the preface to the *Acta* of Dordt is cited by Posthumus Meyjes, 'De doorwerking van de Moderne Devotie, met name bij de Remonstranten', p. 92, note 17.

the Calvinist Jacobus Trigland selected witnesses from the early period of the Dutch Reformation to demonstrate the correctness of this thesis for his *Kerckelijke geschiedenissen* (1650), the Remonstrant historians Johannes Wtenbogaert and Geraerdt Brandt also appealed to certain representatives of the early period to support the contention that they were the true heirs of the original Dutch Reformation. This gave the debate about the original character of the Dutch reformation a political dimension which became more prominent when the Calvinists argued that the Remonstrants posed a danger to national security. Since, so they reasoned, a Remonstrant was a Pelagian and a Pelagian Roman Catholic, and a Roman Catholic favoured the Spaniards, the Remonstrants therefore endangered the nation. In contrast, *politiques* or *moyenneurs*[30] such as Cornelis Pieterszoon Hooft and Hugo Grotius maintained that their opinions not only conformed to the form and values of the early Christian church, but also matched the national character of the developments in the Netherlands. As they saw it, Calvinism—imported and thus alien—posed a threat to the indigenous nature of the Dutch Reformation.

In his 1597 discourse on religious persecutions, C.P. Hooft (1547–1626), mayor of Amsterdam, stated that the revolt against Spain had been inspired above all by resistance to the Inquisition and the coercion of conscience. Now, however, Calvinist ministers from the southern provinces were introducing a new persecution on the pretext of ecclesiastical discipline. This was contrary to the "peaceful temper" and the reasonable as well as Christian "nature of these lands".[31] In a similar manner Hugo Grotius explained that the *politiques* wanted to reform the abuses in the spirit of Erasmus, while the ministers read the books of Calvin in which "personal opinions" were propounded with fanaticism. As Grotius saw it, these opinions went against the indigenous character of the Dutch Reformation which had been formed by the writings of Erasmus, the *Huysboeck* of Heinrich Bullinger, the *Loci* of Philip Melanchthon and particularly by *The Layman's Guide* (*Der leecken*

[30] See Alain Dufour, 'Das Religionsgespräch von Poissy: Hoffnungen der Reformierten und der Moyenneurs', in G. Miller, ed., *Die Religionsgespräche der Reformationszeit*. Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte, 191 (Gütersloh, 1980), pp. 117–126, at pp. 121–122.

[31] See *Memoriën en adviezen van C.P. Hooft*, H.A. Enno van Gelder, ed., II. Werken uitgegeven door het Historisch Genootschap te Utrecht, III–48 (Utrecht, 1925), pp. 42–43 and pp. 46–47.

wegh-wyser) of Anastasius Veluanus.[32] In his *Pietas*, his defence of the policies of the States of Holland and West Friesland, Grotius described the 'thread' that ran through developments from Erasmus to his own day. He too censured the Calvinist pastors from France and neighbouring places (he meant Geneva and Heidelberg) who had spread throughout the Low Countries and who tried to plant the doctrines they had learned there. These teachings, perhaps appropriate for Geneva and France, ran contrary to the nature of the Dutch people, who were "very attached to the works of Erasmus". The Dutch had also been enlightened by the writings of Anastasius Veluanus and Dirck Volkertsz Coornhert, which dealt with predestination in the manner of Erasmus in his polemic with Luther. This 'national reformed' movement, according to Grotius, culminated in the person and ideas of Jacobus Arminius.[33]

The historiographical debate about the original character of the Reformation in the Netherlands, the debate about who had been there first and who thus had the oldest claims, the Remonstrants or the Calvinists, began in 1646 with the publication of a history by Johannes Wtenbogaert, the leader and organizer of the Remonstrants, who had died in 1644. Wtenbogaert is said to have once told his Calvinist opponents, "We were here before you".[34] The explicit aim of Wtenbogaert's *Kerckelicke historie* was to affirm the validity of just such a claim by means of historical testimonies. However, it is remarkable that he makes no attempt either to describe an indigenous movement in his survey of the development of the Reformation in the Netherlands, or to legitimize his party by referring to such a movement. Not even Erasmus appears as a witness. Here Wtenbogaert clearly parts with the aforementioned Remonstrant apologists Hooft and Grotius. He thinks it characteristic of the original Dutch Reformation that there were no

[32] Hugo Grotius, *Verantwoordingh van de wettelijcke regieringh van Hollandt ende West-Vrieslandt* ([Hoorn,] 1622), pp. 29–32.

[33] Hugo Grotius, *Ordinum Hollandiae ac Westfrisiae Pietas* (1613). Critical Edition with English Translation and Commentary by Edwin Rabbie. SHCT 66 (Leiden, 1995), p. 150 (par. 61); *Der Heeren Staten van Hollandt ende West-Vrieslandt godts-diensticheyt … verdedicht* (The Hague, 1613), pp. 42–43. As late as the end of the eighteenth century this view was repeated by the Remonstrant church historian Jacobus Regenboog in his *Historie der Remonstranten*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1774–1776).

[34] This quote is reported by F. Pijper, 'Geestelijke stroomingen in Nederland voor de opkomst van het Remonstantisme', in G.J. Heering, ed., *De Remonstranten: Gedenkboek bij het 300-jarig bestaan der Remonstrantsche Broederschap* (Leiden, s.a. [1919]), pp. 37–60, at p. 37.

dominant reformers, such as Luther in Germany, Zwingli in Switzerland or Calvin in Geneva and France. Many different people, lay as well as clergy, "began the work, gradually at different times and in different places". Wtenbogaert pointed to foreign influences and to the importance of writings that were translated from German and French and which were spread in secret.[35] He thus presented the Dutch Reformation as a "part and variant of a very broad movement of reform which had manifested itself everywhere in the church of the sixteenth century".[36] But he did introduce several figures and writings to establish that the Remonstrant view of predestination had appeared early in the Netherlands. He mentioned the confession of Johannes a Lasco and *Der leecken wechwyser* by Anastasius Veluanus. Tongue-in-cheek, he reminded his readers that the Calvinist Professor Nerdenus had referred to these works with words of praise. He rejected the Calvinist appeal to other dissidents of this period because he felt that there were no (or not enough) sources that allowed for a precise definition of their opinions.[37]

The Calvinists decided that Wtenbogaert's vision of the development of the Reformation movement in the Netherlands could not remain unchallenged. In 1647 the Leiden professor Jacobus Trigland prepared to commit the Calvinist version of the common past to paper.[38] In his *Kerckelijcke geschiedenissen*, which appeared in 1650, Hoen began to play a role in the historiographical debate.

Trigland believed that the light of truth shone more brightly in the seventeenth than in the previous century. He regarded the (early) sixteenth century as a completed phase of Reformation history. But he was willing to be seduced—as he put it—to discuss *not* the truth, but the antiquity of his doctrinal views with regard to the early Reformation in the context of a church historical survey.[39] His history represented a page-by-page discussion of Wtenbogaert's *Historie*. Thus he found himself, in the third part, faced with the task of finding dis-

[35] Johannes Wtenbogaert, *De kerckelicke historie* (s.l., 1646), pp. 141–142.

[36] G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes, 'De doorwerking van de Moderne Devotie, met name bij de Remonstranten', p. 93.

[37] Wtenbogaert, *Kerckelicke historie*, pp. 142–164. For a more extensive treatment of Wtenbogaert's point of view, see Spruyt, 'Martin Bucers *Gulden Brief*', pp. 99–109.

[38] For earlier Calvinist attempts to describe their past, see J.G.R. Acquoy, 'Mislukte pogingen der Nederlandsche Gereformeerde Kerken, om hare geschiedenis te doen beschrijven', in *Geschiedkundige opstellen aangeboden aan Robert Fruin* (The Hague, 1894), pp. 229–257. For Trigland see H.W. ter Haar, *Jacobus Trigland* (The Hague, 1891), pp. 156–176.

[39] Spruyt, 'Martin Bucers *Gulden brief*', pp. 90–109.

sidents whom he could present as evidence for Calvinist ideas. To expound how "several of our Dutch nation were gradually brought to the knowledge of holy truth", Trigland began his story with a description of the life and teachings of Wessel Gansfort, based on Hardenberg's *Vita Wesseli*. He inserted a Dutch translation of the entire passage about Hoen and "other learned and enlightened Dutchmen". He thought he could typify Wessel as a proto-Calvinist because he had declared that the grace of God "was effective not only in the present, but that it had already been determined by God from the beginning (*van eeuwicheidt*)".[40] On the basis of the 1557 dedication to the Court of Holland, Zeeland and Friesland with which Gnapheus had prefaced his *Tobias and Lazarus*, Trigland also gave a description of the persecution suffered from 1523 by Gnapheus and "a Master Cornelis Hoen or Honius".[41] Trigland provided his readers with an extensive summary of Gnapheus's dialogue between Tobias and Lazarus, for, he said, it contained pious words "about divine providence, human depravity and misery, true faith, communion with Christ and the merit of love which teaches humility and consoles".[42] He combined Hardenberg's information about Hoen and the *scriptum* with the passage from Lavater concerning Hoen's letter, and remarked that the *scriptum* discussed by Hardenberg and the letter mentioned by Lavater must not be thought of as one and the same for the following reasons: 1) The *Vita* spoke of a "little book" ("boeckjen", the *scriptum*) and Lavater mentioned a letter; 2) The little book, which was estimated to be two hundred years old, had been found among Hoeck's books while the letter had been written by Hoen himself; 3) The style and Latinity of Hoen's letter differed from the style of a medieval treatise, which the *scriptum* (written two hundred years earlier) was; 4) The *Vita* reported that *Henricus* Rhodius, father of the Utrecht Brotherhouse, took the *scriptum* together with Wessel's writings to Luther for his approval. Lavater mentioned two men, Joannes (not Henricus) Rhodius and Georgius Saganus, who showed Hoen's letter only to Zwingli. Nevertheless Trigland assumed that the *scriptum* and Hoen's letter must have been in agreement: "perhaps Mr. Hoen had borrowed some light from the *scriptum*".[43] After these percep-

[40] Jacobus Trigland, *Kerckelijcke geschiedenissen* (Leiden, 1650), p. 121verso. Trigland referred to Wessel's *De oratione*, I, 20 (= *Opera*, pp. 37–38).

[41] Trigland, *Kerckelijcke geschiedenissen*, pp. 121recto–122verso.

[42] *Kerckelijcke geschiedenissen*, pp. 122verso–125verso.

[43] *Kerckelijcke geschiedenissen*, pp. 125verso–125recto.

tive remarks Trigland gave a Dutch translation of "the good Hoen's" letter, of which he had obtained a copy. Although Trigland recognized that the letter contained nothing that concerned "the controversy of the Remonstrants", he also wrote that it showed clearly "how correctly and simply those first adherents of the Reformation in the Netherlands, and in particular in Holland, understood the Lord's Supper as well as how far they were from the crass sentiments of the Lutherans and how they based their correct views on solid and clear arguments which, moreover, do not accord with the basic teachings of the Remonstrants".[44] Following the translation,[45] Trigland concluded "that this pious and godly man had not held views which the Remonstrants hold now".[46]

Trigland's interest in Hoen and his letter preserved Hoen's memory in the public Reformed Church.[47] Johannes Spiljardus, pastor of Gorinchem, added a Dutch translation of Hoen's treatise to the popular *Schat-boeck*, the much-enlarged Dutch translation of Zacharias Ursinus's *Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism*. In his dedicatory preface to the magistrate of Amsterdam and the directors of the East India Company, Spiljardus argued that the "biblical doctrine of the Lord's Supper" had already been known in the province of Holland "in the first Reformation", as became evident from Hoen's letter on the subject. Spiljardus's references to Hardenberg's *Vita*, Lavater's *Historia* and Gnapheus's preface betray his dependence on Trigland. Although his Dutch version of the letter is virtually identical to Trigland's, Spiljardus did not mention his name. Spiljardus's edition of the *Schat-boeck* went through three printings, which contain just as many reprints of Trigland's translation of Hoen's letter.[48]

---

[44] *Kerckelijcke geschiedenissen*, p. 125recto.

[45] *Kerckelijcke geschiedenissen*, pp. 125recto–130verso.

[46] *Kerckelijcke geschiedenissen*, p. 130verso.

[47] The *Synopsis purioris theologiae* (published in 1625), the authoritative reference book on Reformed theology at the time, in its seventieth thesis of the forty-fifth *disputatio* on the Lord's Supper (*praeside D. Antonio Thysio*) pointed with approval to Hoen's interpretation of *Hoc est corpus meum* as *Hoc significat corpus meum*. Thysius explained that such an explanation *non raro accipitur* and in support he cited several biblical texts *ubi metaphora est in praedicatio*. But he also pointed out that in *locutiones sacramentalis* one considers not only *significatio* and *similitudo*, but also *obsignatio* and *exhibitio*. "At *est*, tum partim praedicati, partim copulae rationem habet, ut ex vocis resolutione patet." See *Synopsis purioris theologiae*, H. Bavinck, ed. (6th ed., Leiden, 1881), p. 523.

[48] *Schat-boeck der verklaringen over den Nederlandtschen Catechismus, uyt de Latijnsche lessen van Dr. Zacharias Ursinus … nieuws oversien door Johannes Spiljardus* (Amsterdam, 1664), II, *2recto–*4verso; repr. Amsterdam 1694, Gorinchem, 1736.

On 16 August 1657 the Great Assembly of the Remonstrant Brotherhood decided "to continue and complete the *Kerkelijke Historie* of the late Uyttenbogaerdt". They commissioned the still-young pastor Geraerdt Brandt (1626–1685) and promised him full cooperation by sending him money for the costs and the relevant documents. In 1652 Brandt had become the Remonstrant pastor in Nieuwkoop. He accepted the task with great pleasure, "for he was inclined and prepared under all circumstances to serve the common interests of the Remonstrants".[49] In the following years he published two brief surveys of the history of the Dutch Reformation, as well as a volume of documents.[50] The first volume of his *Historie der Reformatie*, which covered the period until 1600, appeared in 1671. The second volume, which appeared in 1674, treated the period from 1600 to 1618.[51] This volume encountered so much resistance from Calvinist pastors that Brandt decided not to publish the remaining volumes (covering the period 1618–1623) during his lifetime. The (rather sloppy) edition of those volumes by his son Joannes was not published until 1704.[52] Brandt's writing career took a decisive turn after 1675, when he dedicated himself almost exclusively to literature.[53]

Although Brandt's *Historie* is an elegantly written plea for tolerance and ecclesiastical peace and although he is emphatic about his own neutrality, the commission from the Remonstrant church suggests that his description is no less biased than that of his opponents. This is further evidenced by Brandt's letter of 6 June 1660 to Engelbertus van Engelen, Remonstant pastor of Gorinchem. After surveying the various attempts by the Remonstrant church to write a "Remonstrant history", Brandt explained his decision to "bring into the open our own just actions", as well as the false accusations of the opposite party, in order to prevent members of their party from "lapsing" to the

[49] G.M.C. Loeff, *De Nederlandsche kerkgeschiedschrijver Geeraardt Brandt* (Utrecht, 1864), p. 23.

[50] In 1658 Brandt published a *Kort verhael van de Reformatie* and in 1662 he edited *Brieven van verscheijde vermaerde en geleerde mannen deser eeuwe* (letters of learned men of renown who had played a prominent role in the religious controversy of the age). In 1663 he published his *Verhaal van de Reformatie in en ontrent de Nederlanden*, the contents of which are fully repeated in the first volume of the *Historie der Reformatie*, which for that reason was referred to on its title-page as the second edition when it appeared in 1671.

[51] G. Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie en andre kerkelyke geschiedenissen in en ontrent de Nederlanden* I (Amsterdam, 1671), II (Amsterdam, 1674).

[52] G. Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie…* III–IV (Rotterdam, 1704).

[53] Loeff, *De Nederlandsche kerkgeschiedschrijver Geeraardt Brandt*, pp. 63–70.

established church.[54] His *Historie der Reformatie* should thus be regarded as a "History of the Remonstrants", written by a Remonstrant pastor to a commission of the Remonstrant Brotherhood.[55]

Nevertheless, Brandt's exposition is, by the standard of seventeenth-century ecclesiastical historiography, courteous, irenic and broad-minded. Peter Burke notes "its tone of gentle expostulation, sorrow rather than anger, and […] its opposition to exclusive claims to possess the truth" and further reduces Brandt's partisanship by remarking that "the party he [Brandt] supported was the anti-party party". Brandt, moreover, frequently used the rhetorical technique of expressing his opinion indirectly by camouflaging it with the words or reactions of contemporaries.[56]

But Brandt evidently could not distance himself from his party's claim to be heir to the original Dutch Reformation. He shows a particular interest in extensive discussions of humanist dissidents who, while favouring reform and criticizing the church, did not take a radical position. Thus he praised Erasmus's moderation in insisting on a "middle way between two extremes" and his emphatic distinction between "dissent, heresy and revolt".[57] He presents the edicts issued by Emperor Charles V and the introduction of the Inquisition into the Netherlands as primarily an "infraction on the liberties of the country".[58] He discusses at length the fate of Cornelis Grapheus, town secretary of Antwerp and one of the first victims of the Inquisition; he reproduces Grapheus's petition to Joannes Carondelet in a Dutch translation.[59] In Brandt's hands, the Dutch Pope Adrian VI (1522–1523) becomes the poorly understood reformer of the Roman church who died too soon.[60] Similarly, extensive passages are dedicated to such moderate reform-

---

[54] See Georg Penon, *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis der Nederlandsche letterkunde* II (Groningen, 1881), pp. 156–159; P. Burke, 'The Politics of Reformation History: Burnet and Brandt', in A.C. Duke and C.A. Tamse, edd., *Clio's Mirror: Historiography in Britain and the Netherlands*. Britain and the Netherlands, 8 (Zutphen, 1985), pp. 73–85, at p. 83, note 22; Burke assumes that this important letter was written to Joachim Oudaen, but see Penon, *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis der Nederlandsche letterkunde* III (Groningen, 1884), p. 67.

[55] Loeff, *De Nederlandsche kerkgeschiedschrijver Geeraardt Brandt*, p. 77; Penon, *Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis der Nederlandsche letterkunde* II, pp. 159–162.

[56] Burke, 'The Politics of Reformation History', pp. 76–77.

[57] Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie* I, p. 65.

[58] Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie* I, p. 70.

[59] Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie* I, pp. 71–79.

[60] Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie* I, pp. 80–86.

ers as Angelus Merula, Cornelis Cooltuyn, Hubert Duifhuis and Caspar Coolhaes.[61] In his description of the first years of the Reformation, Brandt remarks that Luther's teachings had become known "by the greater part of the people of Holland, Zeeland and Flanders". Among those who helped spread the new doctrines, he mentions Martinus Dorpius, Philippus de Lens, Wouter Deleen and Petrus Nannius.[62] Thanks to Nerdenus's *Praefatio*, he knew that in Utrecht the new doctrines had been accepted by Johannes ("others call him Henricus") Rhodius and that in Delft Cornelis Hoen had deviated from popery with his interpretation of the words instituting the Lord's Supper.[63] He related the fortunes of the *scriptum* according to Hardenberg's *Vita*; for his description of Pistorius's trial he used Gnapheus's martyrologium and other martyrologies.[64] Brandt borrowed his information about the imprisonment of Hoen and Gnapheus and some of the latter's subsequent fortunes from Gnapheus's preface to *Tobias ende Lazarus*.[65] In his discussion of Hoen, he included a marginal reference to a letter of Erasmus but did not quote from it.[66]

The wealth of information in Brandt's observations and his attractive style set him apart from the haphazardly compiled apologetics of his predecessors. He did not add, however, to what was known about Hoen and his *Epistola*; he did not have any more sources at his disposal than Trigland had had. The latter's perceptive remarks on the relationship between the *scriptum* and Hoen's own letter may have made Brandt wary of the uncertainties surrounding the two documents. On the one hand, then, the historiographical debate between the Remonstrants and the Calvinists produced a Remonstrant portrait of the early Reformation in the Netherlands as a variant development within an international reform movement in which Hoen played a significant role. On the other hand, the Calvinists never formulated a clear alternative to this interpretation. Trigland merely imputed a Calvinistic doctrine of grace to some of the early reformers and concluded that Hoen was no Remonstrant. Nevertheless his critical remarks on the relation-

---

[61] Because of Brandt's strict adherence to chronology these 'portraits' are spread throughout the first volume.

[62] Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie* I, pp. 91–92.

[63] Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie* I, p. 92.

[64] Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie* I, pp. 92–95.

[65] Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie* I, pp. 95–96.

[66] Brandt, *Historie der Reformatie* I, p. 95; Brandt referred to the London edition of Erasmus's letters (1642), see now Allen, ep. 1358.

ship between the *scriptum* and Hoen's *Epistola* posed a problem which remained to be solved. The crucial chapter of the *liber de bonis vulso ecclesiasticis dictis* by Schoockius was published too late for Wtenbogaert and Trigland; Brandt was unfamiliar with it.[67]

3. *Daniel Gerdes*

In the eighteenth century only the erudite church historian Daniel Gerdes (1698–1765) occupied himself with Hoen. Gerdes's work is a landmark of Reformation historiography. Although writing in the conventional parameters of confessional church history, he explicitly aimed to bridge the confessional chasm between Lutherans and Reformed. He stressed the independence of the Reformed tradition begun by Zwingli while correcting the Luther-centred Reformation of Lutheran church historians.[68] An antiquarian, he spent his entire life in search of rare books and manuscripts in order to increase the available sources and thereby to widen the historical horizons.[69] Each volume of Gerdes's *Historia Reformationis* concludes with editions of several of the rare documents cited in the text; together these appendices take up 870 pages.[70] For the history of the Reformation in the Netherlands, the subject of the third volume of his *Historia Reformationis*, he also reproduced rare and long-forgotten documents. He re-edited Nerdenus's *Praefatio*[71] and used Schoockius's seventh chapter. Among his *monumenta* he included a new edition of the Wittenberg theses of Henry of Zutphen, various writings of Pierre Loyseleur de Villiers, documents concerning Hardenberg's struggles in Bremen and information about Francisco de Enzinas, as well as the text of the *Disputatio Groningae habita* of 1523.[72]

---

[67] Sepp, *Bibliotheek van Nederlandsche kerkgeschiedschrijvers*, pp. 211–212, suspects that Schoockius's history attracted little attention because it was hidden in a work on a totally different subject.

[68] C. Augustijn, 'Das Bild der Reformation bei Daniel Gerdes und Johann Lorenz von Mosheim', NAK 64 (1984) 78–90, at pp. 78–83.

[69] Gerdes's correspondence is frequently a fascinating report on this unceasing hunt for books and manuscripts. A list of letters (University Library, Groningen, HS Add. 125) and a summary of their content can be found in Witteveen, *Daniel Gerdes*, pp. 248–258.

[70] Augustijn, 'Das Bild der Reformation bei Daniel Gerdes', p. 80, note 15.

[71] *Supra*, note 18.

[72] Witteveen, *Daniel Gerdes*, pp. 217–231 surveys Gerdes's editorial activities.

Gerdes also edited Hoen's *Epistola* from an apograph which he had obtained.[73] The information supplied in the introduction is primarily based on the few sources available, namely Gnapheus's martyrology of Pistorius and his preface to *Tobias ende Lazarus*, Lavater's *Historia*, Hardenberg's *Vita* and Erasmus's letter to Pierre Barbier which had been cited by Brandt. But Gerdes also added some new information. Referring to Isaäc le Long's *Boekzaal der Nederduitsche bybels*, Gerdes rejected Salomon van Til's suggestion that Hoen and others had translated a New Testament that was published in 1523.[74] He argued that nothing was known of the identity of Georgius Saganus (who according to Lavater had accompanied Rode) but his name, unless he was the same as the Gulielmus Sagarus mentioned by Hardenberg and Pierre de la Ruë. Without giving his reasons, Gerdes also rejected Trigland's contention that the *scriptum* and Hoen's *Epistola* were two distinct documents.[75] Given the painstaking and critical documentation that is the hallmark of Gerdes's work, it is ironic that two new details he supplied and which thereafter enjoyed a long life appear to be incorrect. Gerdes stated that Hoen's *Epistola* was written in 1521 and published by Zwingli in Zurich in 1525.[76] Here Gerdes drew on a note by Hermann von der

---

[73] Daniel Gerdes, *Introductio in historiam Euangelii passim per Europam renouati doctrinaeque reformatae* I (Groningen, 1744), appendix: *Monumenta antiquitatis ad illustrandam historiam Reformationis ecclasticam facientia*, pp. 228–240; Witteveen, *Daniel Gerdes*, p. 223, incorrectly states that Gerdes cited (sic!) Hoen's *Epistola* after "the oldest edition by Zwingli in 1525".

[74] Salomon van Til, *Inleydinge tot de profetische schriften…* (Dordrecht, 1684) mentioned several translations of the Bible prior to the *Statenvertaling* (1637), to show the latter's superiority as it alone was based on the canonical text of the Bible. One of these was the New Testament which had been printed in Amsterdam in 1523 by Doen Pietersz. The translation, differing from the standard Latin version, was rather free, said Van Til, but contained "praiseworthy prologues" and "annotations … against the papacy", which is why he suggested it was the work of Hoen, Gnapheus, Rode and "others who at that time held those views". Isaäc le Long *Boekzaal der Nederduitsche bybels* (Amsterdam, 1732) rejected this idea. According to C.C. de Bruin, *De Statenbijbel en zijn voorgangers: Nederlandse bijbelvertalingen vanaf de Reformatie tot 1637*, F.G.M. Broeyer, ed. (Haarlem–Brussel, 1993), pp. 76–80, Johan Pelt was the translator of this New Testament, which was based on Luther's German translation. For the translation based on Erasmus's *Nouum Testamentum*, which appeared in Delft in 1524 and may indeed have been produced in Hoen's circle, see C.C. de Bruin, *De Statenbijbel en zijn voorgangers*, pp. 105–109. See the discussion below in chapter II.4.

[75] Gerdes, *Historia Reformationis* I, p. 231, note b: "[Triglandius] qui, vt nobis videtur, minus […] recte scriptum illud ab Epistola hac Honii diversum fuisse indicat"; and see p. 230, note c.

[76] Gerdes, *Historia Reformationis* I, p. 231: "Zwinglius eandem hanc epistolam (quae anno 1521 dicebatur scripta fuisse) Tiguri anno 1525 typis imprimendam curauit".

Hardt.[77] In the third volume of his *Autographa Lutheri et coaetaneorum*, Von der Hardt does indeed mention Hoen's treatises among the books *in -8° variorum* which were published in 1525,[78] but he mentions neither editor nor place; for these attributions Gerdes alone must be held accountable. But they were accepted for the next two centuries. Gerdes's edition of an apograph of the *Epistola* was also to cause serious misunderstanding. He sowed confusion by inserting *per Honnium Batavum* in the title; if accepted, the title suggests that the *Epistola* was *missa per Honnium Batavum*, which could mean that the letter was sent by Hoen, but written by someone else. This insertion would later lead to the denial of Hoen's authorship.

4. *The Nineteenth Century: Romanticism and Nationalism*

The historiographical debate on the early Reformation took a new turn in 1819 when Annaeus Ypey (1760–1837), professor of theology in Groningen, and Isaäc Johannes Dermout (1777–1867), who was both court chaplain and permanent secretary of the synod of the Dutch Reformed Church (*Nederlandse Hervormde kerk*), published the first volume of a four-volume *History of the Dutch Reformed Church*.[79] Ypey gave a view of the Reformation which proved to be highly controversial. In essence he agreed with the Remonstrant historians; only his formulations and labels differed. He regarded the Reformation as the greatest and most important event in the history of the Christian church and as nothing less than the rebirth of the Apostolic church.[80] Although the religious, moral and intellectual enlightenment achieved by the Reformation had been anticipated by Valla, Reuchlin, Wyclif, Hus,

---

[77] Gerdes, *Historia Reformationis* I, p. 231, note a: "Id quod ex Hardtii Autographis Lutheri, T. III, p. 127 colligimus".

[78] Hermann von der Hardt, *Antiqua literarum monumenta, autographa Lutheri aliorumque celebrium virorum, ab A. 1517 vsque ad A. 1546*, III: *[Tomus] Autographorum Lutheri et coaetaneorum* (Helmstadt, 1623), p. 127.

[79] A. Ypey and I.J. Dermout, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk*, 4 vols. (Breda, 1819–1827). See Sepp, *Bibliotheek van Nederlandsche kerkgeschiedschrijvers*, pp. 213–215, in whose view Dermout worked only on the fourth volume. On Ypey, see J. Kamerling, 'De kerkhistoricus Annaeus Ypey (1760–1837): nuance, vooroordeel en veroordeling', NAK 55 (1974–1975) 192–236.

[80] Ypey, *Beknopte geschiedenis van de Hervorming der christelijke kerk in de zestiende eeuw* (Groningen, 1817), p. 5.

Tauler and Ruusbroeck,[81] this transformation was only really achieved in the sixteenth century. This, Ypey maintained, was *exclusively* due to "our Netherlandish nation".[82] His claim was easy to support: the improvement in education was due to Geert Groote; printing had been invented by Laurens Jansz. Coster of Haarlem, and the restoration of letters and Christian theology remained the work of Erasmus and his northern precursors Wessel Gansfort and Rudolf Agricola, both—significantly—"born in Groningen".[83] Erasmus rather than Luther was the real reformer; Luther had only popularized his work.[84]

Ypey's history of the early Reformation in the Netherlands offered nothing new. He dealt with the figures mentioned in Schoockius; when he described Pistorius's martyrdom, he mentioned Gnapheus and "Kornelis Hoon or Hoen".[85] Although these three men had been accused of Lutheranism, Ypey maintained they were actually Zwinglian, which is in complete accordance with his conviction that the original Reformation had been entirely "Zurichs" or "Zwinglian".[86]

Nationalism and the promotion of patriotism in the early nineteenth century thus proved the goal as well as the matrix of historiography.[87] This became still more prominent in the ecclesiastical histories by the theologians of the "Groningen movement" (*Groninger Richting*). They were strongly influenced by the Utrecht professor Philip Willem van Heusde (1778–1839) and through him by the German Romantic J.G. Herder.[88]

---

[81] See Kamerling, 'De kerkhistoricus Annaeus Ypey', pp. 202, 220.

[82] Ypey, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk* I, p. 2.

[83] Ypey, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk* I, pp. 4–5.

[84] Ypey, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk* I, pp. 36–37.

[85] Ypey, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk* I, pp. 104–107 and "Aanteekeningen", pp. 40–41.

[86] The orthodox opposition to Ypey's interpretation found a discerning spokesman in the jurist Carel Maria van der Kemp (1799–1862), who belonged to the "Reveil" circle in The Hague. He went to the heart of the matter by centring the discussion on the meaning of the concept of 'reformation'. Upholding "the honor of the Dutch Reformed Church"—as he announced in the title of his book—he predictably concluded that the Dutch Reformation was already "pure Calvinist" at this early period. See C.M. van der Kemp, *De eere der Nederlandsche Hervormde kerk gehandhaafd tegen Ypey en Dermout*, 3 vols. (Rotterdam, 1830–1833), I, pp. 4–46, 164–169, 183.

[87] See P.B.M. Blaas, 'The Touchiness of a Small Nation with a Great Past: The Approach of Fruin and Blok to the Writing of the History of the Netherlands', in Duke and Tamse, edd., *Clio's Mirror: Historiography in Britain and the Netherlands*, pp. 133–161.

[88] On Van Heusde, see J. Roelevink, *Gedicteerd verleden: het onderwijs in de algemene geschiedenis aan de universiteit te Utrecht, 1735–1839* (Amsterdam–Maarssen, 1986), pp. 291–315. In his teaching of history, Van Heusde, the spiritual father of a generation, had

The group of young theologians in and around Groningen was to play a prominent role in the history of both church and theology in the nineteenth century. In several publications they too defended an original, indigenous [Northern] Netherlandish Reformation, which they placed in sharp contrast to the un-Dutch Calvinism that had supplanted the native movement. Their interpretation also had a specific objective: they wanted to establish a less dogmatic and broadly evangelical *volkskerk* ("church for the whole people", in contrast to a church with narrower, dogmatically defined borders), but in this they were opposed by the more orthodox Calvinists of the "Reveil", the friends of C.M. van der Kemp.[89]

Among the prominent spokesmen for this influential current were Petrus Hofstede de Groot (author in 1842 of an extensive treatment of "the course, taken thus far by Christian theology in the Netherlands in general"), W. Muurling and C.P. Hofstede de Groot.[90] Following his father, the latter published a history of the Dutch reformation in 1883 in which the nationalistic element was the foundation stone. In his work, the younger De Groot completed the long development of Hoen as

---

broken with the tradition of polyhistory and made himself the proponent of a moderate Christian enlightenment. The morals and character of peoples rather than the *res gestae*—that is, the facts, events and the actions of individuals in a geographic and chronological context—were the central focus of his teaching. His optimistic eighteenth-century humanism made him search the *historia gentium* above all for the *historia humanitatis* and he strove to explain its development causally. The relationship between the various eras he compared to the ages of man; in this view, the German nations, reborn through Christianity, represented adulthood. As Van Heusde saw it, this stage of maturity was characterized by independence and a search for personal liberty. For his influence on the 'Groninger richting', see J. Huizinga, *Geschiedenis der [Groningse] universiteit gedurende de derde eeuw van haar bestaan, 1814–1914* (1914) in *Verzamelde werken* VIII (Haarlem, 1951), pp. 36–339, at pp. 139–163, and J. Vree, *De Groninger godgeleerden: de oorsprongen en de eerste periode van hun optreden (1820–1843)* (Kampen, 1984), pp. 40–52, and *sparsim*. Huizinga observed that the Groningen theologians transposed this "rather unexpected and separate form of Romanticism" into a concept of history as the stage for God's education of mankind towards ever greater perfection. In his discussions of the development of nations Van Heusde drew the attention of his students to the particular importance of characteristically Dutch phenomena, for example the uniqueness of such figures as Geert Groote (pp. 143, 147).

89 See Vree, *De Groninger godgeleerden*, pp. 302–305.

90 P. Hofstede de Groot, 'Beschouwing van den gang, dien de christelijke godgeleerdheid dus verre in Nederland heeft gehouden', *Nederlandsch archief voor kerkelijke geschiedenis* 2 (1842) 121–190 (see also Vree, *De Groninger godgeleerden*, pp. 284–289); W. Muurling, *Over de echt christelijke beginselen der oorspronkelijke Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk* (Groningen, 1849). In 1831, Muurling published a *Commentatio historico-theologica* and in 1840 an *Oratio* on Wessel Gansfort *Groningensis*; see Vree, *De Groninger godgeleerden*, p. 357.

the show-piece of a particular, national and indigenous Reformation. After all, had Hoen not derived his views from the fifteenth-century 'Groninger' Wessel Gansfort? Had he not developed his convictions independently of the Wittenberg Reformer? Did the impact of Hoen's letter not show that the so-called Swiss doctrine of the Eucharist "originated on Dutch soil"?[91]

In a rejoinder to De Groot's study, Herman Johannes Royaards, one of the editors of the *Archief* (the journal in which De Groot senior had published his 1842 article), argued that the Groningen scholars' historiography showed that they too easily overlooked the complex diversity of the past, naming as "Dutch" whatever appealed to them.[92]

In spite of Royaards's criticism of De Groot, the *Archief*, which he and his cousin N.C. Kist had founded in 1829, also propounded the ideology of a national and authentic Dutch Reformation. Kist, too, had been influenced by Van Heusde. In several articles he analysed the differences between the national characters of the German and Latin peoples and attempted to demonstrate the significance of these differences as they related to the introduction of the Reformation. Kist as well as his Groningen colleagues[93] had, moreover, been influenced by the German church historian Carl Ullmann, who had published a

---

[91] C.P. Hofstede de Groot, *Honderd jaren uit de geschiedenis der Hervorming in de Nederlanden, 1518–1619* (Leiden, s.a. [1883]), pp. 49–54.

[92] H.J. Royaards, 'Brieven aan Prof. P. Hofstede de Groot, over den gang der christelijke godgeleerdheid in Nederland', *Nederlandsch archief voor kerkelijke geschiedenis* 2 (1842) 329–382, at pp. 338–339. The labours of the *Groninger richting* in ecclesiastical history were in fact nothing but an annoying intermezzo between the work of Gerdes and the "Dutch Historical School", to be discussed later in this chapter. J. Lindeboom, 'Honderd jaren kerkgeschiedenis naar honderd jaren Archief', NAK 22 (1929) 199–218, at p. 208, referred to the "uncomplicated synthesizing" of the Groningen historians; Huizinga, *Geschiedenis der [Groninger] universiteit*, pp. 150–153, spoke of their "nimble historical constructions" and held that their interpretation was based more on intuition and emotion than on historical research. It is remarkable that Huizinga at the same time believed that "the representation of an original, purely national Reformation in the Netherlands has been increasingly and without change in direction, confirmed by the church historical studies of the twentieth century" (p. 151). In support of this view, Huizinga cited a review by L. Knappert of J.W. Pont, *Geschiedenis van het Lutheranisme in de Nederlanden tot 1618* (Haarlem, 1911); Knappert agreed with Pont that there had been no strong Lutheran movement in the sixteenth-century Low Countries and added that, instead, there had been "an original Dutch Reformation, a view increasingly adhered to by many scholars during recent years" (*Museum* 20 [1913] 229–231).

[93] Vree, *De Groninger godgeleerden*, pp. 32–38, 289.

study of Wessel Gansfort in 1834 which was to be followed in 1841–1842 by the two-volume *Reformatoren vor der Reformation*.

In his monograph on Wessel,[94] Ullmann declared that he was particularly interested in the era of "the Reformation before the Reformation" and his work on Wessel was the first fruit of his studies into this period.[95] Ullmann sketched the nature of the fifteenth century and the life and theology of Wessel. But he repeatedly turned his attention to the impact of Wessel's ideas on the following generation in order to achieve the objective of establishing Wessel's relationship to the Reformation, casting him as a "precursor of the Reformation" ("Vorläufer der Reformation"). Thus he expanded his treatment of Wessel's eucharistic doctrine to include Hardenberg's discussion of the relationship between Wessel's works and the polemics about the Lord's Supper begun by Karlstadt. Here he assumed that the "old treatise" was identical to Wessel's *De sacramento eucharistiae* and that Hardenberg had overestimated the significance of that work for the outbreak of the sacramentarian controversy.[96] Nevertheless, Ullmann called Wessel a "pronounced precursor of the Zwinglian and, in general, of the reformed doctrine".[97] Ullmann, in 1834, did not discuss Hoen and his *Epistola*.

In 1840 Johann Carl Ludwig Gieseler, in the third volume of his *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, both criticized and complemented Ullmann's expositions. Gieseler denied that Karlstadt had been influenced by Wessel's views in the development of his eucharistic doctrine: the "old treatise" attributed to Wessel had been brought to Wittenberg in 1521 when Karlstadt still adhered to the doctrine of transubstantiation. The bet between Luther and Karlstadt to which Hardenberg referred had not taken place until 1524 in Jena. Although Gieseler does not actually say so, he assumed that the "old treatise" was the same as Hoen's *Epistola* as published by Zwingli. According to Gieseler, the person "apud quem omne iudicium sacrae scripturae fuit" and who had—according to the title-page—rejected the *Epistola* was none other than Luther. From the formulation *ab annis quattuor* in the title, he concluded that Zwingli had become acquainted with the *Epistola* in 1521.

---

[94] C. Ullmann, *Johann Wessel, ein Vorgänger Luthers. Zur Characteristik der christlichen Kirche und Theologie in ihrem Übergang aus dem Mittelalter in die Reformationszeit* (Hamburg 1834); a Dutch translation by W.N. Munting appeared the following year: *Johannes Wessel, een voorganger van Luther* (Leiden, 1835).

[95] Ullmann, *Johann Wessel*, pp. ii–iii.

[96] Ullmann, *Johann Wessel*, pp. 324–328.

[97] Ullmann, *Johann Wessel*, p. 340.

The delay in the edition Gieseler explained as the result of Zwingli's original reluctance to express his real views concerning the Lord's Supper.[98]

Two years later, N.C. Kist published in the *Archief* an extensive discussion of the Leiden dissident Petrus Bloccius (ca. 1530–ca. 1594) and his book *Meer dan twee hondert ketteryen, blasphemien ende nieuwe leeringen, welck uut de Misse zijn ghecomen* (1567).[99] Not surprisingly Kist described him as representing "the original spirit that marked the Dutch Reformed Church before it took a totally changed direction as a consequence of Walloon, French and Genevan influences". Kist remained, however, at a loss to name this native spirit of the Dutch Reformation: "If only I knew what to call the unique spirit of Bloccius's thought, or if only I could call it simply *Gansfortian*, *Erasmian*, *Zwinglian* or something like that".[100] He would have preferred to call Bloccius's eucharistic doctrine *Zwinglian* if he had not known that this so-called Zwinglian doctrine was of pure Dutch origin.[101] Kist clarified this opinion in an appendix. There he repeated the information from Hardenberg's *Vita*, supplemented with the facts supplied by Lavater, Ullmann and Gieseler. Since it had initiated the sacramental controversy and since it had altered the views of men like Zwingli and Oecolampadius, he concluded that Hoen's *Epistola* must be considered of great importance.[102]

When he wrote this article, Kist had not yet seen the second volume of Ullmann's *Reformatoren vor der Reformation*, which focuses on Wessel Gansfort.[103] Ullmann's views of the relationship between the Middle

---

[98] Johann Carl Ludwig Gieseler, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* III/1 (Bonn, 1840), p. 188, note 24, pp. 192–193, note 27, p. 194, note 30 and p. 195, n. 31.

[99] N.C. Kist, 'Petrus Bloccius. Eene bijdrage tot de inwendige geschiedenis der Nederlandsche kerkhervorming en eene proeve van haren onafhankelijken oorsprong en hare zelfstandigheid', *Nederlandsch archief voor kerkelijke geschiedenis* 2 (1842) 1–113. On Bloccius, see Petrus Bloccius, *Praecepta formandis puerorum moribus perutilia*, A.M. Coebergh van den Braak, ed. Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia, 6 (Louvain, 1991).

[100] Kist, 'Petrus Bloccius', p. 88.

[101] Kist, 'Petrus Bloccius', p. 89.

[102] N.C. Kist, 'De Nederlandsche oorsprong der Zwingliaansche Avondmaalsleer', *Nederlandsch archief voor kerkelijke geschiedenis* 2 (1842) 114–119, at p. 119.

[103] C. Ullmann, *Reformatoren vor der Reformation, vornehmlich in Deutschland und den Niederlanden*, 2 vols. (Hamburg, 1841–1842; repr. Gotha, 1866). I refer to the reprint. In this work Ullmann essentially repeats the interpretation of his 1834 study, but the discussion of Wessel's eucharistic doctrine has been significantly expanded. Ullmann drew partly on the findings of G.H.M. Delprat, *Verhandeling over de broederschap van Geert Groote en over de invloed der Fraterhuizen* (2nd ed., Arnhem, 1856), pp. 153–155. See Delprat's wry exhibition of the relationship, pp. III–IV.

Ages and the Reformation were determined on the one hand by the Lutheran antithesis of Law and Gospel and on the other by Luther's battle with both Roman Catholicism and the Radical Reformation. Ullmann defined the Reformation as the reaction of Christianity as Gospel against Christianity as Law. It was the legalism of the medieval church which had caused the emergence of a heretical spiritualism. The Reformation had been successful in finding a way between the two movements of the "false letter" and the "false spirit". Earlier precursors like Johan Pupper of Goch and Wessel Gansfort had fought a similar battle on both fronts. As Ullmann saw it, the Reformation, therefore, was not a revolution but rather the flower and fruit of late medieval developments.[104] In his *Reformatoren vor der Reformation* Ullmann, more explicitly than in his earlier work, showed how Wessel had prepared the ground for the reformed teachings on the Eucharist.[105] Not only Wessel, but also Erasmus and others from the Low Countries should be listed among the founders of reformed doctrine. It was for this reason, Ullmann said, that the reformed interpretation of the Lord's Supper had been so well received in the Netherlands: "they only returned fully grown to the earth in which they had first taken root" ("sie kehrte nur wieder, ausgewachsen, auf den Boden zurück, in dessen heimischem Grunde sie die ersten Wurzeln geschlagen").[106] The "demonstrable connection" between Wessels's ideas and Hoen's interpretation of the Eucharist consisted of Hardenberg's well-known passage in his *Vita*, to which Ullmann added the detail he derived from Gerdes, *viz.* that Hoen added to both the *scriptum de coena* and to Wessel's writings "his one writing on the Lord's Supper which has come down to us".[107] Ullmann credited Hardenberg's report of Rode's visit to Luther as highly reliable and dated this visit to 1520.[108] Basing himself on Von der Hardt and Gerdes, he pointed to Zwingli as the editor of Hoen's treatise in

[104] See Heiko A. Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought Illustrated by Key Documents* (New York, 1966; repr. Philadelphia, 1981), pp. 32–33.

[105] Ullmann, *Reformatoren vor der Reformation* II, p. 560, and see pp. 561–562: "Hier erscheint er [sc. Wessel] ganz entschieden als ein Vorläufer Zwingli's und der reformirten Lehre, und zwar nicht blosz vermöge einer inneren Analogie der Denkweise, sondern auch, wie es wenigstens höchst wahrscheinlich ist, vermöge eines bestimmt nachweisbaren Zusammenhangs".

[106] Ullmann, *Reformatoren vor der Reformation* II, p. 563.

[107] Ullmann, *Reformatoren vor der Reformation* II, p. 564; Gerdes, *Historia Reformationis* I, p. 230, note c.

[108] Ullmann, *Reformatoren vor der Reformation* II, pp. 564–568.

1525.[109] Hoen's influence on Zwingli he discussed in detail.[110] He next gave an extensive summary of Hoen's *Epistola*[111] and also attempted "to solve a critical question", namely, what exactly was the *vetus scriptum* mentioned by Hardenberg? In Ullmann's view, contrary to Gerdes's opinion, the *scriptum* and Hoen's *Epistola* were not identical; the *scriptum* was by Wessel himself and might be identified with *De sacramento eucharistiae*, or more probably with the collection of several *Propositiones de corpore et sanguine Christi* which in the Wittenberg and Basel *Farrago* of works by Wessel (1522–1523) had been printed separately, but in the Groningen *Opera* (1614) had been included as an appendix to *De sacramento eucharistiae*.[112]

When Kist read Ullmann's *Reformatoren vor der Reformation*, he wrote an article in which he not only corrected an error in his previous essay but also informed his readers about "the important results" of Ullmann's further research.[113] Kist gratefully acknowledged that Ullmann had established Wessel as the founder, not of the Lutheran, but of the reformed doctrine of the Eucharist and that his research had removed any doubt about the Dutch origin of the "Zwinglian and Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper".[114] Kist was able to agree with Ullmann's attribution of the *scriptum de coena* to Wessel, but not with his identification of the *scriptum* with either *De sacramento eucharistiae* or the *Propositiones*. Neither of these two writings contain the figurative interpretation of the words of institution which had so impressed the finders of the *scriptum*. Kist proposed that the *scriptum* was an elaboration of *De sacramento eucharistiae*, just as the latter was an elaboration of the *Propositiones*, and argued that the letter attributed to Hoen had in reality been written by Wessel. This proposal he based on the following arguments. Gerdes had given the title as *Epistola … ex Batavis missa … per Honnium Batavum*; this can only be read as "sent by Hoen" and not as "written by Hoen". The same reading must be given to the report by Lavater, who probably incorrectly concluded from Zwingli's title that Hoen was

---

[109] Ullmann, *Reformatoren vor der Reformation* II, p. 569, note 95.

[110] Ullmann, *Reformatoren vor der Reformation* II, pp. 570–575.

[111] Ulmann, *Reformatoren vor der Reformation* II, pp. 575–579.

[112] Ullmann, *Reformatoren vor der Reformation* II, pp. 579–582. Ullmann was unfamiliar with the edition of *De sacramento eucharistiae* by Simon Corver, Zwolle, ca. 1520.

[113] N.C. Kist, 'Nog iets over den Nederlandschen oorsprong der zoogenaamde Zwingliaansche Avondmaalsleer', *Nederlandsche archief voor kerkelijke geschiedenis* 3 (1843) 385–402.

[114] Kist, 'Nog iets over den Nederlandschen oorsprong', pp. 387–393.

the author of the *Epistola*. Furthermore, Hardenberg nowhere mentions a work written by Hoen. Finally, Kist explained that passages which could not have been written by Wessel (such as "Ruet vniuera religio papae, quam aliquando casuram quis dubitabit? cum eam modo magna ex parte videas cecidisse") had been interpolated by Zwingli, just as Zwingli (according to the title) had added several things at the end of the text.[115]

These publications from the first half of the nineteenth century raised questions concerning Hoen and his *Epistola* which remained to be solved; they are, therefore, of great importance to Hoen's *fortuna critica*. But they still presented the entangled and seemingly inextricable facts in a dogmatic and nationalistic context and none of them broke with the tradition of confessional historiography.[116] Real innovations in Dutch church history resulted from the work of two critics of the direction taken by Kist. Although these two critics, J.G. de Hoop Scheffer and W. Moll, differed in the grounds of their opposition to Kist, their work was to become highly significant for the study of the early Dutch Reformation.

5. *Innovations and Consolidations: From J.G. de Hoop Scheffer and W. Moll to the Leiden Historical School*

In a witty and ironic essay in *De Gids*, the Mennonite church historian Jakob Gijsbert de Hoop Scheffer (1819–1893) rejected the antiquarian approach to history in favour of true historiography. As an example, the Amsterdam professor singled out a brief period which, in his view, needed a thorough re-examination in a well-written study: "The remarkable decade of 1520 to 1530, when religious life was awakened everywhere and the entire country trembled in its desire for reform, still waits for its historian".[117] He took up his own challenge and began to publish a detailed description of the era in the *Studien en bijdragen*

[115] Kist, 'Nog iets over den Nederlandschen oorsprong', pp. 393–402.

[116] Such interpretations remained in vogue well into the nineteenth century, for example in the works of B. Glasius, B. ter Haar and G. Montijn, which were aimed at a wider public; see Nauta, 'De Reformatie in Nederland in de historiografie', pp. 216–217.

[117] J.G. de Hoop Scheffer, 'De studie der vaderlandsche kerkhistorie', *De Gids* 29 (1865) 201–213, at pp. 210–212.

op 't gebied der historische theologie. His contributions were published as a book in 1873.[118] Although subsequent research has supplemented several details and corrected others, this six-hundred-page study with its thorough documentation remains to the present day the most complete survey of early sixteenth-century dissent in the Netherlands.

De Hoop Scheffer divided his material into three periods, subdividing each of these by geography. His discussion of the Delft–The Hague circle and Hoen was extensive. He argued that Wouter, the dissident Dominican who was saved from oblivion by Schoockius, established a congregation "that, as far as we know, is the oldest of all protestant churches in our fatherland".[119] He then sketched a portrait of the members of this congregation, paying most of his attention to Hoen, "the man who most of all contributed to the spread of the new opinions in Delft and his place of residence, The Hague". Not only did De Hoop Scheffer place the facts concerning Hoen in a new ideological context, but he also added important new pieces of information. He suggested that Hoen was descended from a family of mayors in Gouda and had received his early education at the Hieronymus school in Utrecht under Joannes Simons of Delft.[120] In his treatment of Hoen he made use of new published sources—among them Burman's edition of a letter from Cornelis Aurelius to Hoen, and letters by Erasmus—as well as of archival materials. He used the third *Memoriaelboek* of the jurist Sandelijn and the *Protocollen* of Andries Jacobsz. to give an extensive description of Hoen's trial.[121] In view of all this, it is somewhat surprising to find that De Hoop Scheffer uncritically followed Hardenberg's *Vita*. He also accepted Ullmann's view that the *scriptum* was identical to Wessel's *Propositiones* and that these had inspired Hoen to write his own treatise on the Lord's Supper. De Hoop Scheffer suggested, however, that Hoen's interpretation was more radical than Wessel's, for Hoen had rejected "once and for all everything that smacked of transubstantiation".[122] He provided a lengthy summary of Hoen's treatise based on

[118] J.G. de Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland*. The *Studiën en bijdragen* was a continuation of the *Archief*; four volumes appeared between 1870 and 1880. De Hoop Scheffer and Moll were its editors.

[119] De Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland*, p. 83.

[120] De Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland*, pp. 86, 87.

[121] De Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland*, pp. 174–179, 351–394.

[122] De Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland*, pp. 86–90. De Hoop Scheffer was unfamiliar with the 1520 edition of Wessel's *De sacramento eucharistiae* as well. Hardenberg's statement that the *scriptum* was at least 200 years old he rejected "as

Gerdes's edition, calling it "one of the most remarkable monuments of the Reformation era".[123] Rode's journey and Hoen's influence on Zwingli were also reviewed. He placed Rode's visit to Luther in the winter of 1520–1521, the visit to Oecolampadius in January of 1523 and to Zwingli later that year.[124] From one archival document De Hoop Scheffer learned that Hoen's widow had been condemned to pay two hundred Carolusguilders in 1529. De Hoop Scheffer believed that she had housed a female fugitive.[125]

A German translation by P. Gerlach of De Hoop Scheffer's *magnum opus* with a preface by Friedrich Nippold appeared in 1886.[126] In 1888 it was reviewed by the Erlangen church historian Theodor Kolde.[127] He hailed the translation gratefully, but added that it had appeared at least ten years too late. The translator had only mentioned the new literature concerning the *Summa der godliker scrifturen* that had appeared since De Hoop Scheffer had finished his manuscript; he had neither mentioned nor included other new facts and views.[128] According to Kolde, Ullmann's interpretation of the relationship between Wessel and Hoen (which had been taken over by De Hoop Scheffer), as well as De Hoop Scheffer's description of Rode's travels, had been disproved in the meantime. A. Dieckhoff had demonstrated that Rode's visit to Luther took place in 1522.[129] Kolde himself thought Rode's visit to Luther still unproven, and was of the opinion that Hardenberg's *Vita* was unreliable and very imprecise.

---

a fabrication of a later age when the Reformed wanted to recommend their doctrine of the Lord's Supper with its antiquity" (p. 88, note 2).

[123] De Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland*, pp. 93–98.

[124] De Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland*, pp. 98–99, note 3, and pp. 105–106, note 1. De Hoop Scheffer relied on Nerdenus's *Praefatio* for the date of the visit to Oecolampadius. In dating Rode's visit to Zwingli to 1523, De Hoop Scheffer departed from Ullmann, Kist and Gieseler, who had concluded, on the basis of the phrase *ab annis quatuor* in the title of the edition of Hoen's treatise, that Zwingli had received it in 1521.

[125] De Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland*, pp. 547–548.

[126] J.G. de Hoop Scheffer, *Geschichte der Reformation in den Niederlanden, von ihrem Beginn bis zum Jahre 1531. Deutsche Originalausgabe, herausgegeben von Dr. P. Gerlach, mit einem Vorwort von Dr. F. Nippold* (Leipzig, 1886).

[127] *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 13 (1888) 252–254.

[128] De Hoop Scheffer, *Geschichte der Reformation in den Niederlanden*, pp. ix, 377–382; cf. J. Trapman, *De Summa der godliker scrifturen (1523)* (Leiden, 1978), p. 8.

[129] A. Dieckhoff, *Die evangelische Abendmahlslehre im Reformationszeitalter* I (Göttingen, 1854), pp. 275–298.

Kolde's review prompted a thorough and detailed examination of the printing history of Wessel's writings and Rode's travels by a young church historian, Otto Clemen, who published his findings in 1898.[130] Clemen accused Kolde of having written an improper review.[131] He, too, traced errors in Hardenberg's *Vita*, but concluded that in many places it proved reliable. His own reconstruction—by a careful evaluation of primary and secondary sources—of the printing history of Wessel's writings and the chronology of Rode's led him to conclude that "the exposition by De Hoop Scheffer and his followers" deserved to be accepted as the most likely. His research allowed him, however, to change some things and to determine others more precisely. Thus he arrived at the following "probable sequence of events". The care of the papers of Jakob Hoeck, who had died on 11 November 1509, was entrusted by his nephew Martinus Dorpius to Cornelis Hoen, with whom Dorpius had been at the Hieronymus school in Utrecht. Among these papers, Hoen found many of Wessel's writings, including the treatise on the Lord's Supper. Inspired by this treatise Hoen established his own views in the form of a letter. Rode, carrying Wessel's writings and Hoen's letter *De coena Domini*, visited Wittenberg early in 1521. Luther was much taken by Wessel's writings, but because of his own journey to Worms and his subsequent refuge in the castle of Wartburg he could not undertake their publication himself. On 29 July 1521 he wrote a preface from the Wartburg recommending Wessel's writings. Rode returned to the Netherlands and began the Zwolle edition of Wessel's works; in 1522 he was removed from his Utrecht rectorate because of his 'Lutheran' sympathies.[132] Together with Georgius Saganus he then went abroad again. During the winter of 1522–1523 he visited Oecolampadius in Basel, in the summer of 1523 he saw Zwingli in Zurich and in the autumn of 1524 he met Bucer in Strasbourg.[133]

Some ten years later Clemen qualified his 1898 article as partly the product of a novice; he no longer considered Hardenberg's *Vita* to be

---

[130] O. Clemen, 'Hinne Rode in Wittenberg, Basel, Zürich und die frühesten Ausgaben Wesselscher Schriften'.

[131] Clemen, 'Hinne Rode', p. 352 ("ungerechte Hyperkritik").

[132] De Hoop Scheffer, too, had already culled this new fact from an article by Willem Moll, 'Aanteekeningen van een tijdgenoot, betreffende de opkomende Hervorming en hare verbreiding, inzonderheid in het fraterhuis te Doesburg', *Kerkhistorisch archief* 3 (1862) 108–115, at p. 111.

[133] Clemen, 'Hinne Rode', pp. 370–372.

a historical source.[134] But his reconstruction of the printing history of Wessel's works was accepted by Maarten van Rhijn in his dissertation about Wessel and most recently, with some modification, by Cornelis Augustijn.[135]

In addition to the contributions by De Hoop Scheffer, the studies by Willem Moll (1812–1879), professor in Amsterdam, were also innovative. He had been Kist's student but their personal relationship had been poor. Moll consciously broke with his teacher's "Heusdian" presuppositions.[136] Instead he organized his work according to the plain principle of the historical-critical method, examining the sources in strict neutrality and avoiding the rivulets that only indirectly depended on the sources. Moll imparted his rigorous application of these principles to his students who were dubbed the "Dutch historical school" (*Nederlandsche historische school*) by Frederik Pijper, a pupil of the next generation.[137] Moll himself published works on the early church, Dutch ecclesiastical history before the Reformation and the fifteenth-century theologian Johannes Brugman, as well as works on later reformers such as Anastasius Veluanus and Angelus Merula.[138] His most gifted student, J.G.R. Acquoy, professor at Leiden from 1878 to 1896, wrote his dissertation on Geert Groote and devoted one of his most impressive works to the Windesheim movement.[139] But Frederik Pijper, Acquoy's successor, concentrated primarily on sixteenth-century dissent in the Netherlands

---

[134] WA 10/II (1907), pp. 315–316, note 1: "Überhaupt konnte ich jetzt an jenem Erstlingsaufsatz zum grossen Teil die Arbeit der Penelope vollziehen." Hardenberg's *Vita Wesseli* "möchte ich […] überhaupt nicht mehr als Geschichtsquelle gelten lassen".

[135] Van Rhijn, *Wessel Gansfort*, Appendix C (b), lvii–lxx; C. Augustijn, 'Wessel Gansfort's Rise to Celebrity', in F. Akkerman, G.C. Huisman and A.J. Vanderjagt, edd., *Wessel Gansfort and Northern Humanism*. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 40 (Leiden, l993), pp. 3–21. Augustijn does not accept Clemen's view that the Zwolle and Wittenberg editions of the *Farrago* were based on two different transcriptions.

[136] J. Kamerling, *De kerkhistoricus Willem Moll (1812–1879)* (Leeuwarden, 1979), pp. 9, 14, 29.

[137] F. Pijper, 'Kist, Moll en Acquoy, de grondvesters der Nederlandsche historische school', NAK 4 (1907) 237–252; on the differences between Kist and Moll, see pp. 244–247.

[138] A complete bibliography of Moll's works can be found in the obituary by J.G.R. Acquoy in *Studien en bijdragen op 't gebied der historische theologie* 4 (1880) 476–540.

[139] On Acquoy, see F. Pijper, 'Levensbericht van Johannes Gerhardus Rijk Acquoy', *Levensberichten der afgestorven medeleden van de Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde te Leiden* (Leiden, 1898), pp. 290–331.

and his work was continued by his successors Johannes Lindeboom and Albert Eekhof.[140]

Pijper (1859–1926), who was professor at Leiden from 1897–1924, is best known for a monumental collection of sixteenth-century writings by advocates of reform and their opponents. He published the ten-volume *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica* in cooperation with his Amsterdam colleague, the Mennonite S. Cramer.[141] Pijper provided each document with a lengthy introduction and, additionally, published the results of his studies in a work on Erasmus's influence on the origins of the Dutch Reformation and in a book on the spiritual currents in the Netherlands before the emergence of Remonstrantism.[142] Within the (so-called) "national Dutch reform movement", Pijper isolated a left wing consisting of the (Ana)baptists[143] and a right wing which could be further divided into three distinct groups. To the first of these belonged humanists and rectors of Latin schools, men like Gnapheus, Listrius, Grapheus and Bloccius. The second group consisted of men of the "middle road" such as Cassander, Coornhert and Viglius of Ayta. The third, whose members "were decisively in favour of reform" and who were the "outstanding [representatives] of the original Dutch national reformation movement", included the author of the *Summa der godliker scrifturen*, as well as Angelus Merula and Gnapheus. Pijper also included Hoen among this last group, due to his 'symbolic' interpretation of the Lord's Supper. Pijper further isolated a group, active in the later stages of the Reformation, whose members were reformed but not Calvinist, for example Johannes a Lasco, Johannes Utenhove and Martin Micron. The spirit of Calvin had little impact before 1566; afterwards it became strong and the dominant force in the Netherlands.[144] Pijper finally concluded that Wtenbogaert had been correct when he told the Calvinists, "We were here before you"; in the period before 1566 many had indeed been reformed without being Calvinist.[145]

---

[140] See J. Trapman, 'Leidse kerkhistorici over Erasmus in het begin van de twintigste eeuw', in *Erasmus en Leiden. Catalogus van de tentoonstelling gehouden in het Academisch Historisch Museum te Leiden van 23 oktober tot 19 december 1986* (Leiden, 1986), pp. 83–86.

[141] F. Pijper and S. Cramer, edd., *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica*, 10 vols. (The Hague, 1903–1914).

[142] F. Pijper, *Erasmus en de Nederlandsche Reformatie* (Leiden, 1907); 'Geestelijke stroomingen in Nederland vóór de opkomst van het Remonstrantisme'.

[143] Pijper, 'Geestelijke stroomingen in Nederland', pp. 42–45.

[144] Pijper, *Erasmus en de Nederlandsche Reformatie*, pp. 16–27; 'Geestelijke stroomingen in Nederland', pp. 42–59.

[145] Pijper, 'Geestelijke stroomingen in Nederland', p. 37.

Pijper's student Johannes Lindeboom (1881–1958), professor at Groningen from 1914 to 1953, continued in the direction set by his mentor. In 1913, Lindeboom published a study of the different representatives of the "middle current" of the sixteenth century. Its title, *Biblical Humanism in the Netherlands*, became a concept that is used to this day.[146] In his classic study Lindeboom presented a large number of "biblical humanists" who, in spite of their differences, represented a biblical humanism and piety which in the sixteenth-century Low Countries occupied a prominent place next to, and often in opposition to, Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. This tradition included Erasmus but its actual source was Wessel Gansfort. Lindeboom, too, saw this "middle current" as a typically Dutch phenomenon, and allotted to Hoen a place within this circle of biblical humanists. Without supplying any new information, he placed the well-known facts about Hoen in the context of "a most important event in the history of Christianity, in which Dutch (*vaderlandsche*) elements played a decisive role: the emergence of the Swiss doctrine of the Eucharist".[147] In a later work, Lindeboom united the concept of 'biblical humanism' and the notion of the indigenous characteristics of the Dutch Reformation into the concept of a "Dutch Reforming or National Reformed Movement" ("Nederlandsch-Reformatorische of Nationaal-Gereformeerde Richting"). In this, too, he discussed Hoen and the Dutch sources of the Swiss doctrine of the Lord's Supper.[148]

Although many new facts and sources had been made available since the works of the Remonstrant historians and their nineteenth-century followers, Pijper and Lindeboom, albeit with their more sophisticated and more reserved interpretation of this new information, came to similar conclusions. They decided that an Erasmian "middle current"

---

[146] J. Lindeboom, *Het bijbelsch humanisme in Nederland* (Leiden, 1913); reprinted as *Het bijbels humanisme in Nederland: Erasmus en de vroege Reformatie*, with an introduction by C. Augustijn (Leeuwarden, 1982). J. IJsewijn prefers the formulation "humanist Christianity" over "biblical" or "Christian humanism" as "not the *humanae* but the *christianae litterae* were the final aim of these 'humanists', to whom humanist studies and methods were only the means or the tools for the improvement and reformation of Christendom"; see his 'The Coming of Humanism to the Low Countries', in Heiko A. Oberman and Thomas A Brady, edd., *Itinerarium Italicum: The Profile of the Italian Renaissance in the Mirror of its European Transformations*. SMRT, 14 (Leiden, 1975), pp. 193–304, at pp. 223–224.

[147] Lindeboom, *Het bijbelsch humanisme in Nederland*, pp. 159–162.

[148] J. Lindeboom, *De confessioneele ontwikkeling der Reformatie in de Nederlanden*. Kerkhistorische studiën, 3 (The Hague, 1946), pp. 34, 37, 44–45, 47.

had existed in the first half of the sixteenth century—which eventually developed into Remonstrantism—but in the second half of the century this had been overshadowed by the emerging and subsequently dominant Calvinism.[149]

Albert Eekhof (1884–1933), from 1914–1933 professor *extraordinarius* in Leiden, did not specialize in the Reformation, but his was the honour of stumbling upon a sixteenth-century Latin edition of Hoen's *Epistola*, which he published in 1917 in facsimile with a historical introduction. He reproduced the findings of Clemen, examined the dating of the several stages of Rode's journey and, in particular, he tried to determine which parts of the *Epistola* were Hoen's and which were the additions by Zwingli, its alleged editor (since Gerdes).[150] Ernst Ludwig Enders, who had published a different edition of the Latin *Epistola*, had also discussed this problem.[151] In 1927 the problem was examined again by Walther Köhler in his introduction to a critical edition (by Georg Finsler) of the *Epistola* in Zwingli's *sämtliche Werke*.[152] The views of Enders, Eekhof and Köhler on these technical questions have been analysed in the first part of the fourth chapter, which deals with the text and printing history of Hoen's *Epistola*.

A third Leiden figure, Laurentius Knappert (1863–1943), ecclesiastical professor from 1902–1933, published both a study of the Reformation in Leiden (1908) and a survey of the Reformation in the Netherlands (1924), the last attempt at a synthesis of the Dutch Reformation.[153] In both works Knappert coined a new historiographical term, *viz.* "the era of the sacramentists [or: sacramentarians]", which he applied to the

---

[149] In contrast to his predecessors, Pijper did not want to characterize Calvinism as "non-national or less suitable to the character of the Dutch people": *Erasmus en de Nederlandsche Reformatie*, p. 26. Pijper and Lindeboom, both of them liberal, opposed the interpretations of the Reformed church historians A. Kuyper, H.H. Kuyper and F.L. Rutgers; on this, see especially Blom and Misset, "'Een onvervalschte Nederlandsche geest"'.

[150] *De Avondmaalsbrief van Cornelis Hoen (1525). In facsimile uitgegeven en van inleiding voorzien door Dr. A. Eekhof* (The Hague, 1917).

[151] Ernst Ludwig Enders, ed., *Dr. Martin Luthers Briefwechsel* III (Calw and Stuttgart, 1889), pp. 412–425.

[152] Z IV, pp. 505–509. In his *Zwingli und Luther: Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl nach seinen politischen und religiösen Beziehungen*, Köhler focused on the place and significance of Hoen's *Epistola* in the emergence and development of the eucharistic controversy.

[153] L. Knappert, *De opkomst van het Protestantisme in eene Noord-Nederlandsche stad: Geschiedenis van de Hervorming binnen Leiden, van den aanvang tot het beleg* (Leiden, 1908); the same, *Het ontstaan en de vestiging van het Protestantisme in de Nederlanden* (Utrecht, 1924).

entire early stage of the Reformation.[154] He used the term to indicate that, while Luther exercised considerable influence in these early years, the first representatives of the Dutch Reformation could not really be called Lutherans. There was "too much originality in the Dutch evangelicals", while on many points they agreed with Zwingli, "in particular on the doctrine of the Eucharist". This last statement conveyed that these representatives were critical of the sacrament of the altar and the Roman Catholic interpretation of the Eucharist. To justify his use of the epithet, Knappert further pointed out that the word "sacramentarians" often occurred in contemporary documents.[155] Knappert saw this period as succeeded by the stages of Anabaptism, the national-reformed and the Calvinist reformed. Following De Hoop Scheffer he credited Wouter as the founder of the first Dutch reformed congregation.[156] He discussed its familiar members in a separate chapter, and offered no new facts concerning Hoen.[157]

---

[154] Knappert, *Opkomst van het Protestantisme*, pp. 111–112; *Ontstaan en vestiging van het Protestantisme*, p. 137. Earlier, De Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland*, pp. 109–110, had drawn attention to the term. Throughout his book he used the term "evangelicals" to denote those who were in favour of reform; the term "sacramentarissen" he used, in contrast to Knappert, not to denote the early period as such and in its entirety, but to indicate a certain facet of the movement, *viz.* its "so-called Zwinglian doctrine of the Lord's Supper".

[155] Knappert, *Opkomst van het Protestantisme*, p. 66.

[156] Knappert, *Ontstaan en vestiging van het Protestantisme*, p. 116.

[157] Knappert, *Ontstaan en vestiging van het Protestantisme*, pp. 137–161. Recent scholars have meanwhile dissociated themselves from the terminology used by Knappert and Lindeboom. The latter had already expressed his view that it was incorrect to describe the decade of 1520–1530 as the era of 'sacramentarism': opposition to the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, Lindeboom wrote, was neither the only nor the "most fundamental characteristic" of that period. The name 'sacramentarians' dated from the period itself, "but this fact just limits its validitiy" (Lindeboom, *Confessioneele ontwikkeling der Reformatie*, pp. 33–34). In his study of the Reformation in Friesland of 1962, J.J. Woltjer also rejected the use of the term 'the sacramentarian era' to denote the period 1520–1530: it is a strictly negative epithet which only indicates what was not believed, and it also stresses one-sidedly "but one aspect of the Reformation, the denial of transubstantiation" (J.J. Woltjer, *Friesland in de Hervormingstijd* [Leiden, 1962], p. 102). In a detailed and thoroughly documented article of 1983, J. Trapman expanded the conclusions of Lindeboom and Woltjer. The movement favouring reform was broadly based and while criticism of the Mass was but one aspect, many dissenters had no objections at all to the sacrament of the altar: J. Trapman, 'Le rôle des "sacramentaires" des origines de la Réforme jusqu'en 1530 aux Pays-Bas', NAK 63 (1983) 1–24. The discussion on the subject was continued by C. Augustijn, S. Zijlstra, A.C. Duke and J. Trapman in *Doopsgezinde bijdragen* 15 (1989) 121–148. Woltjer also wrote that "the term 'national-reformed' was inappropriate as a name describing the currents of reform before 1566". The word "evokes the image of a schism, a break

If the interpretations of the Leiden professors met with criticism, they also received support—most unexpectedly—from the Lutheran church historian J.W. Pont, who in 1911 published a lengthy study on the history of Lutheranism in the Netherlands. He concluded that while Luther had been a figure of great authority for the partisans of reform until 1530, "typically Lutheran" ideas had exercised no influence in that era. The Lutheran reformation, Pont argued, had not become part of the life of the people and it played a very secondary role in the Netherlands of the sixteenth century.[158] For example, Hoen had contacts with Luther through Hinne Rode but he was in no way dependent on Luther. Pont suggested that if Hoen and his circle had understood Luther's actual views, they would never have appointed him.[159] Knappert, who reviewed this study, valued this negative conclusion as "extraordinarily positive, for the great significance of the work before us, written for its own particular goal, lies in its having independently and with the aid of independent sources, arrived at the same representation of an original Dutch reformation at which others, in their own way, have also arrived".[160]

---

with the established church, but before 1566, even among those who were strongly influenced by protestant ideas, large numbers remained in the established church". The lack of dogmatic demarcation and the tolerant (*rekkelijk*) character of the early Dutch adherents of reform was, as Woltjer saw it, not typically Dutch but reflected the fact that everything was still "in an embryonic stage and growing". This first generation groped for its own direction without support of a particular tradition while "listening to many voices". It would be one or two generations later before "a more stable situation would emerge from the ferment of those early decades" (*Friesland in Hervormingstijd*, pp. 102–104).

[158] J.W. Pont, *Geschiedenis van het Lutheranisme in de Nederlanden tot 1618* (Haarlem, 1911), pp. 283–287.

[159] *Ibidem*, pp. 24, note 24; 136, 231.

[160] *Museum* 20 (1913) 229. The Mennonite historian W.J. Kühler also thought that the Dutch Reformation was conceived in the "national soul of the people". He preferred the term 'evangelical' over 'sacramentarian'. Kühler distinguished between humanists, the "precursors of the national reformed movement", and "the people". The people were at first without direction but developed a "non-ecclesiastical" independence which stood at the cradle of Anabaptism: W.J. Kühler, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche doopsgezinden in de zestiende eeuw* (2nd ed., Haarlem, 1961), pp. 23–51. But others criticized the views of the Dutch historical school. The Lutheran J. Loosjes was of the opinion that the Dutch reformation had indeed been characteristically Lutheran (*Geschiedenis der lutherse kerk in de Nederlanden* [The Hague, 1921]). The Calvinist preacher G. Oorthuys recognized the existence of a "more originally Dutch current among the Reformed in the Netherlands" but argued that genuine Protestantism manifested itself only later (*Anastasius' 'Wechwijser', Bullingers 'Huysboeck' en Calvijns 'Institutie' vergeleken in hun leer van God en mensch. Eene bladzijde uit de vaderlandsche theologie vóór de Synode van Dordrecht* [Leiden,

6. *Recent Modifications and Re-Examinations*

Most recently, the Reformation has come to be regarded as an undifferentiated, complex movement, the heretical nuances of which are difficult to identify by means of accepted (anachronistic) categories.[161] J. Trapman, in his dissertation on the *Summa der godliker scrifturen* (1978), concluded after a detailed analysis of this treatise and other early Reformation writings that "the common characteristic of those who favoured the new ideas" consisted of "a desire for Christian liberty that was provoked by the gospels and the epistles of Paul". The early reform-minded saw Luther and Erasmus as allies and the influence of the one did not diminish that of the other.[162] This conclusion was also founded on an examination of Hoen's *Epistola.* Trapman suspected that perhaps there was not even an indirect connection "between Hoen's treatise and the works of Wessel who, as we know, never was in doubt about the doctrine of transubstantiation". Possibly Hoen's *Epistola* was nothing more than an "elaboration of the mysterious *scriptum* that was thought to be more than 200 years old". Trapman gave a concise summary of Hoen's essay, discussed the two German translations and expressed his agreement with Dieckhoff, who had pointed out Luther's influence on Hoen's *Epistola.* Trapman also sought to identify the direct borrowings from Erasmus's *Annotationes* in Hoen's letter.[163] In his article on the so-called 'sacramentarians', Trapman included a discussion of Hoen's *Epistola* and maintained that Hoen could not be called a 'sacramentarian' since he placed such great importance on the sacrament: "Pour Hoen le sacrement est le gage (pignus) de la promesse divine, qui consiste en la rémission des péchés".[164]

C. Augustijn also suggested categorizing the 1520s

> "as a still undifferentiated renovating movement in which both Erasmus and Luther played a role, in which it is sometimes possible to identify people who focused primarily on Erasmus or primarily on Luther. This,

---

1919]. Maarten van Rhijn detected in Pijper's interpretation the dubious influence of Ullmann and stated that Erasmus could in no way be characterized as a 'reformator' ('Nawoord. Nieuwere Erasmus-waardering. Troeltsch en Pijper', in Van Rhijn, *Studiën over Luther's rechtvaardigingsleer* [Amsterdam, 1921], pp. 144–184).

[161] Leendert Meeuwis van Dis, *Reformatorische rederijkersspelen uit de eerste helft van de zestiende eeuw* (Haarlem, 1937) was one of the first to lay emphasis on this.

[162] Trapman, *De Summa der godliker scrifturen*, pp. 117–118.

[163] Trapman, *De Summa der godliker scrifturen*, pp. 113–117.

[164] Trapman, 'Le rôle des "sacramentaires"', p. 20.

> however, does not mean that they orientated themselves exclusively on one or the other because, simply said, the differences between Luther and Erasmus, that is between Reformation and *bonae litterae*, was not yet evident to them, although in retrospect we can detect which influences were dominant in certain theologians".[165]

In an earlier essay on the most important controversial themes in sixteenth-century polemics, Augustijn had argued that the coherence of this world of ideas was determined by a consciousness of the duality of the material and spiritual worlds. Sixteenth-century spirituality was influenced by Erasmus, but less so by him as an isolated figure than "because he had exemplarily given expression to a manner of thought which had a strong representation in certain circles in the Netherlands". To illustrate this intellectual climate Augustijn, without naming him, also alluded to Hoen: "The idea that the words 'this is my body' should not be taken literally but are meant metaphorically as 'this represents my body', just as a portrait is a representation of the person portrayed or a ring is the representation of the love of a man for his wife, originated in these Dutch circles".[166]

Equally innovative and original were the articles by Alastair C. Duke. Duke exploited not only printed sources but also archival materials and he too stressed the eclectic nature of the early Reformation. According to Duke, the 1520s was a period in which Luther's theology was introduced after Christian humanism had already been established and late medieval dissent had exercised its influence. As issues in the 1520s Duke mentioned and described indulgences, the intercession of Mary and the saints, the Mass and the *praesentia realis*. Duke emphasized the importance of the fact that, for a long time, the reform-minded were confronted with a government that insisted on a rigorous maintenance of orthodoxy and the established institutions of the traditional church. The introduction of the Reformation in the towns, according to Duke, followed patterns. In conformist Gouda the dissenters may have borrowed their views from "an oral tradition of pre-Reformation dissent".[167] Duke also connected this new theme to the study of Hoen.

---

[165] C. Augustijn, 'Anabaptisme in de Nederlanden', *Doopsgezinde bijdragen* 12–13 (1987) 13–28, at p. 18.

[166] C. Augustijn, 'Godsdienst in de zestiende eeuw', in *Ketters en papen onder Filips II: het godsdienstig leven in de tweede helft van de zestiende eeuw* (The Hague, 1986), pp. 26–40, at p. 37.

[167] Alastair Duke, 'The Face of Popular Dissent in the Low Countries, 1520–1530'; 'Dissident Voices in a Conformist Town: the Early Reformation at Gouda' and 'Build-

He concluded that Hoen could not have been the source of the opposition to the doctrine of the real presence that emerged in the Netherlands after 1525. Not only did Hoen's essay appear in print too late for that, but Hoen's "dignified statement" was also too much at variance with the "barbarous idiom" and the "country divinity" of popular dissent. Duke suggested that the people borrowed their arguments from an older medieval oral tradition of disbelief and scepticism. Heretics on trial used "a common stock of images and metaphors" that brought to mind the "homespun idiom" of the English Lollards, the Waldensians and the Hussite Taborites.[168]

The studies of Augustijn, Duke and Trapman are far removed from the patriotic and confessional historiography of previous generations. This had portrayed Hoen as a precursor of the Remonstrants or as an early representative of Calvinism, as the ultimate representative of an indigenous Reformation or even as part of a tradition of "Latitudinarianism" with which liberal and modernist church historians aligned themselves. Hoen's *fortuna critica* thus reflects the apologetic abuse of confessional and nationalistic historiography.

Recent studies by the three scholars mentioned have accurately defined the context of Hoen's *Epistola* and brought to light new information about Hoen and his treatise. The historical importance of the subject has once again been raised, by James D. Tracy in his book on Holland under the Habsburgs. He argues that Holland's "apprenticeship in self-government" developed in part in response to the draconian edicts against heresy issued by the central administration in Brussels. Hoen's trial became a precedent in Holland's perennial opposition to the central government. The appeal by the States of Holland to the *ius de non evocando*, which guaranteed that a citizen could only be tried by a duly established court in his own region, resulted in a significant defeat for Charles V. The inquisitor, Frans van der Hulst, was removed and Charles never again tried to establish a court devoted exclusively to the prosecution of heretics.[169] The detached and critical studies about

---

ing Heaven in Hell's Despite: the Early History of the Reformation in the Towns of the Low Countries', in Duke, pp. 29–59, 60–70 and 71–100.

[168] Duke, 'The Origins of Evangelical Dissent in the Low Countries', in Duke, pp. 1–28, at pp. 23–28. See also Duke, pp. 56–57, 69–70.

[169] James D. Tracy, *Holland under Habsburg Rule, 1506–1566: The Formation of a Body Politic* (Berkeley, 1990), pp. 6, 152–155. Peter J.A. Nissen also pointed out that Hoen's case had shown "that the provincial administration had the opportunity (which they

Hoen by scholars like Trapman, Augustijn and Duke laid the foundations for the present book. In fact, the chapter on Hoen's sources can be regarded as an elaboration of Trapman's suggestions about the relationship between Hoen's *Epistola* and the mysterious *vetus scriptum* mentioned by Hardenberg, while Duke's research contains important hints at the possible sources of Hoen's ideas.

exploited) to foil the strict repression [of dissent] desired by Charles V and the Regent". Nissen also saw Hoen's views as illustrative of the entire movement of the early Reformation. Hoen's trial demonstrates that the reformatory opinions which in the Low Countries were popular in small, mostly humanistically educated circles, cannot simply be called Lutheran. Their mostly symbolic interpretation of the sacraments reveals rather an affinity with the theology of Zwingli and other reformers of southern Germany. Antoon E.M. Janssen and Peter J.A. Nissen, 'Niederlande, Lüttich', in Anton Schindling and Walter Ziegler, edd., *Die Territorien des Reichs im Zeitalter der Reformation und Konfessionalisierung. Land und Konfession, 1500–1650* III: *Der Nordwesten* (Münster, 1991), pp. 200–235, at p. 210.

CHAPTER TWO

HOEN'S LIFE AND ITS HISTORICAL SETTING: HIS FRIENDS AND HIS TRIAL

Since the documentation remains distressingly meagre, the sources scarcely allow Hoen to come to life. Although it does not add much substantial information, Gulielmus Gnapheus's *epitaphion* may conveniently serve as an outline of the life of his late friend, whose fellow prisoner he had been eighteen years earlier.[1] Writing in 1541, Gnapheus recalled that The Hague had brought forth the famous Hoen, "the glory of the Dutch soil", and that he was also buried there. Hoen had been worthy of living to the age of Nestor because, as a young man, he had obtained the highest prize, namely the laurel crown of victory, by following the banner of Phoebus (Apollo, the god of poetry). But when Hoen reached a studious age, he combined the study of law with that

[1] Gulielmus Gnapheus, *Morosophus, de vera ac personata sapientia comoedia non minus festiua quam pia* (Dantzig: Franciscus Rhodius, 1541), G3recto–G3verso:

Epitaphion magistri Cornelii Honi iurisconsulti doctissimi apud Hagensis

Hoc cubat in tumulo, lector, Cornelius ille,
Ille Honius Bataui gloria magna soli.
Hunc Haga, quae comitis claro de nomine fertur,
Vt dedit, extinctum sic fouet ipsa sinu.
Quem tenet illa sinu extinctum satisquam peremptum.
Nestoreos annos viuere dignus erat.
Prima tulit quia enim victricis praemia lauri,
Phoebe nouus sequitur dum tua signa tyro.
Sed postquam studiis accessit grandior aetas,
Legibus adiunxit dogmata sacra bonis.
Nominis hinc primi consultus iuris, amicis
consiliis patriae profuit vsque suae.
Doctrinam vero pietatis dum pius ardet,
Et viuit sceleris purus, amansque Dei,
Criminibus falsis, virtutis vt aemula res est
Inuidia, impetitur concutiturque nimis.
Namque Honio quoque mastyges, oestrumque fuere
Gens mala, quam coruo dixeris esse fatam.
Sed pater omnipotens coruos delusit hiantes,
Dans meliora bono fata repente viro.

of theology. As a lawyer of high repute, he had served his country with sincere counsel. As a pious man, he dearly loved the study of theology, and lived free of sin and in the love of God, yet he had been attacked and his life threatened. Envy, Gnapheus added, is always jealous of virtue. Alluding to Horace's *Epistulae* (I,xvi,48),[2] Gnapheus wrote that Hoen met with scourges and hornets, "that evil populace only born to be pecked at as carcasses by ravens". But to their astonishment, the Almighty Father disgraced these ravens when in a flash he conferred on Hoen a better fate.

1. *Background and social standing*

Gnapheus's poem shows that Hoen was born in The Hague, but the year of his birth can only be estimated. Gnapheus reveals that he reached the age of Nestor, and Hoen's advanced age at the time of his death is confirmed in a statement by the regent Margaret of Austria, who wrote in 1523 that Hoen was by then an old man.[3] Moreover, in one of his letters to Hoen in 1524, Cornelius Aurelius praised Hoen's merits in public service, of which he had been informed by Erasmus; since the correspondence between Aurelius and Erasmus came to an end in 1498, Hoen must have held public office before that date.[4] This is confirmed by an *argumentum e silentio*. All public servants of the county were registered in the *Commissieboeken* (lists of appointments) at the chamber of accounts. Though these registers were kept up-to-date, Hoen's name does not figure in any of them. The gap in these *Registers van de commissien* for the period between December 1493 and September 1506 must be the explanation for this absence.[5] Thus, Hoen was

[2] See *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*, Stephanus Borzsák, ed. (Leipzig, 1984), p. 260.

[3] Fredericq IV, no. 125 (p. 180: "homme eagié").

[4] See Henry de Vocht, *Monumenta Humanistica Lovaniensia: Texts and Studies about Louvain Humanists in the First Half of the Sixteenth Century* (Louvain, 1934), p. 292. Aurelius's letter to Hoen was edited by C. Burman in his *Hadrianus VI siue analecta historica de Hadriano sexto trajectino, papa romano* (Utrecht, 1727), pp. 247–250; the passage referred to is found at p. 247. For the correspondence between Aurelius and Erasmus, see Karin Tilmans, *Historiography and Humanism in Holland in the Age of Erasmus: Aurelius and the* Divisiekroniek *of 1517*. Bibliotheca Humanistica et Reformatorica, 51 (Nieuwkoop, 1992), pp. 342–343.

[5] The Hague, ARA, Archief van de Grafelijkheidsrekenkamer, 490–495: Registers van de commissien (these numbers cover the following periods respectively: 1450–1476, 1477–1493, 1506–1517, 1518–1540, 1540–1559, 1560–1580).

appointed advocate before the court some time after November 1493 and before 1498. In view of his matriculation in Louvain in 1454, it seems reasonable to accept 1440 as the approximate year of Hoen's birth. This implies that he was about eighty-five years old when he died.

Hoen came from a distinguished family of "well-born people" ("welgeborenen") from *Westland*; they had lived in the triangular area between The Hague, Rotterdam and the Hook of Holland from the late thirteenth century. The family name is probably a patronymic, derived from *Hoensz.* (son of Hoen) or *Anthoenisz.* (son of Anthoen).[6] Around 1300 one of Cornelis Hoen's ancestors, Jan or Johan Hoen, was appointed an executor of the will of a certain Herman of Poelduinen (one of his kinsmen), who left behind a parcel of land to be sold before the next crusade to the Holy Land was mounted: the proceeds were to equip a crusader to fight the heathen in the name of Herman of Poelduinen. It was not until 1422 that the funds were diverted for the use of a crusade against the Bohemian Hussites. One of the crusaders equipped was Hendrik Hoen.[7]

Cornelis Hoen's name does not figure in the family's genealogy, but only family heirs are listed there. His father Henrick died in 1502; in July of that year Cornelis Hoen inherited his late father's fief at Beukelsdijk which he held from the lords of Cralingen.[8] In the 1512 "Hofboeken" of The Hague, in which the count's clerks registered the land and house rents in The Hague and its surroundings ("Haagambacht"), Hoen's name figures repeatedly. It shows that he rented several parcels of land in The Hague and Eykenduynen for which he paid an annual tax. The total amount of these taxes shows that he was a wealthy man.[9] His wife, Margriet Willemsdochter, sold their ground in Eykenduynen

[6] J.G. de Hoop Scheffer's supposition that Hoen belonged to a family of mayors from Gouda is incorrect; this branch of the family Hoen used to be called 'Thoen van Souburch' and the first names 'Cornelis' and 'Hendrik' did not occur in it. See J.G. de Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland*, p. 86 and W.A. Kooloos, 'Cornelis Hoen en zijn Avondmaalsbrief' (M.A. thesis Tilburg, Theological Faculty, 1981), p. 1.

[7] Ed. van Bergen, *Uit de geschiedenis van Naaldwijk* (s.l., 1924), pp. 17–18; C. Hoek, 'Register van de Heilige Geest te Naaldwijk', *Jaarboek Ons Voorgeslacht* 1961, pp. 9–59, at p. 38.

[8] See C. Hoek, 'Repertorium op de lenen van Honingen', *Ons voorgeslacht* 17 (1962) 33–105, at p. 73.

[9] N.J. Pabon, ed., *De Hofboeken van 's-Gravenhage, 1458–1561* ('s-Gravenhage, 1937), pp. 279, 281, 301, 302, 360, 361, 367, 369.

in 1529 to the guild of the Holy Cross, a spiritual brotherhood which concerned itself with works of charity.[10]

As Hoen was apparently a life-long citizen of The Hague, it can be assumed that he attended the Latin school there. The suggestion that Hoen also studied at the Utrecht Hieronymus school and was educated there alongside Martinus Dorpius by Ioannes Simons of Delft is mere speculation—De Hoop Scheffer proposed it only in order to explain Hoen's later (presumably) favourable disposition towards the writings of the fifteenth-century theologian Wessel Gansfort and his later contacts with Martinus Dorpius and Hinne Rode, one of Simons's successors.[11] Hoen, moreover, must have been much older than Dorpius, who was born in 1485, and for this reason they cannot possibly have been classmates.[12] The Latin school at The Hague was founded in 1367 and it was only in the 1520s that humanism started to dominate the school's curriculum, as was the case elsewhere.[13] In those years Jacobus Volcardus (Jakob Volkerts van Bergen, ca. 1500–1526[?]) was a distinguished teacher in Hoen's place of residence, numbering among his pupils such members of the *jeunesse dorée* as Viglius ab Ayta (1507–1577) and the famous sons of Nicolaes Everardi, the cultured president of the Court of Holland (1463–1532). In a prefatory epistle to Nicolas Clenardus preceding his edition of the second part of Rudolphus Agricola's *Opera*, the Amsterdam humanist Alardus Amstelredamus described Volcardus as exceptionally learned.[14] From 1522 until 1528 Gnapheus, who was also a respectable playwright, acted as rector of the local Latin school.

---

[10] See J.M. Sernee, S.W.A. Drossaers and W.G. Feith, *De archieven van kloosters en andere stichtingen in Delfland* ('s-Gravenhage, 1920), p. 160.

[11] J.G. de Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland*, pp. 86–87; see also p. 33, note 4. In many later works on the early Reformation and Hoen, De Hoop Scheffer's conjecture is repeated as a fact, even, for example, in C.G. van Leyenhorst's lemma on Hoen in Peter G. Bietenholz, ed., *Contemporaries of Erasmus: A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and the Reformation*, 3 vols. (Toronto etc., 1985–1987), II, pp. 192–193.

[12] De Vocht, *Monumenta Humanistica Lovaniensia*, p. 292.

[13] On this subject, see R.R. Post, *Scholen en onderwijs in Nederland gedurende de Middeleeuwen* (Utrecht–Antwerpen, 1954) and P.N.M. Bot, *Humanisme en onderwijs in Nederland* (Utrecht–Antwerpen, 1955).

[14] Rudolphus Agricola, *De inventione dialectica. Lucubrationes*, II, p. **1recto (*vir omnino acris iudicii omniumque rerum copia instructissimus*); see also Alphonse Roersch, ed., *Correspondance de Nicolas Clénard*, 3 vols. (Brussels, 1940–1941), vol. I, pp. 1–7, vol. II, pp. 1–13. Alardus's letter is dated 1 May 1528. For Volcardus as a teacher of the distinguished poet Janus Secundus (1511–1536) and his two brothers, see Alfred M.M. Dekker, *Janus Secundus (1511–1536): De tekstoverlevering van het tijdens zijn leven gepubliceerde werk. Joannes Secundus: Textual transmission of the works published during his lifetime.* Bibliotheca Humanis-

Hoen studied in Louvain, as is proven by the matriculation of "Cornelis Henrici, Traiectensis dioceses", who enrolled in the arts curriculum at Louvain on 17 October 1454 and who is mentioned again in 1466 when he swore on behalf of an underage relative called Cornelius Thome (Thomaszoon) from the same diocese.[15] The records mention that Hoen was attached as a lawyer to the Court of Holland, the highest provincial court, and that he worked there until his death in 1525.[16]

2. *Humanism*

Gnapheus revealed that Hoen as a young man had devoted himself to poetry and had even won "the laurel crown of victory". As J. IJsewijn has made clear, however, such remarks are of little significance since many Neo-Latin poets at this time bestowed the honourable title of *Poeta Laureatus* on themselves as well as on their friends.[17] Hoen's name is not listed among those crowned by Emperor Maximilian; neither has any poem of his come down to us.[18] But Hoen's keen interest in the *studia humanitatis* can be established from other sources.

First, although Hoen and Erasmus were probably not personally acquainted, Hoen's name figures in the latter's correspondence. Erasmus must have known about Hoen by hearsay, while Hoen in his turn had studied Erasmus's *Annotationes*.[19] From Aurelius's epistle to Hoen,

---

tica et Reformatorica, 38 (Nieuwkoop, 1986), pp. 21–22; for Viglius, see Folkert Postma, *Viglius van Aytta als humanist en diplomaat, 1507–1549* (Zutphen, 1983), pp. 15–17.

[15] See Jos. Wils, ed., *Matricule de l'université de Louvain* II (Brussels, 1941), p. 13, nr. 36.

[16] See also A. de Blécourt and E. Meijers, edd., *Memorialen van het Hof (den Raad) van Holland, Zeeland en West-Friesland (Memorialen Rosa) van den secretaris Jan Rosa*, part I–III. Rechtshistorisch instituut, first series, 1 (Haarlem, 1929), p. xlvi; in 1523 Margaret of Austria called Hoen an 'aduocat postulant aud. conseil de Hollande' (Fredericq IV, no. 125).

[17] Jozef IJsewijn, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies* I: *History and Diffusion of Neo-Latin Literature*. Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia, 5 (Louvain, 1990), p. 33.

[18] See Alois Schmid, '*Poeta et orator a Caesare laureatus*: Die Dichterkrönungen Kaiser Maximilians I.', *Historisches Jahrbuch* 109 (1989) 56–108. It should be noted, however, that at least two Dutch humanist poets are known to have received the laureate, but are not listed here either. Maximilian bestowed it on Cornelius Aurelius from Liesveld castle near Schoonhoven in 1508 or 1509; see Tilmans, *Historiography and Humanism in Holland*, p. 43. In 1517 Gerardus Geldenhouwer Noviomagus received the same honour from the emperor; see Geldenhouwer's poem in his *Vita Philippi Burgundi* (1529) in *Collectanea van Gerardus Geldenhauer Noviomagus*, J. Prinsen J.Lz., ed. (Amsterdam, 1901), pp. 248–249.

[19] For Hoen's indebtedness to Erasmus's ideas, see the discussion below, chapter III, 2.

mentioned above, it is clear that Erasmus had heard of Hoen before 1499, for he had told Aurelius about Hoen's professional merits before then. In 1523 Erasmus appears to have heard that Hoen had run foul of the Inquisition. In April 1523 Hoen is mentioned in a letter from Erasmus to Pierre Barbier, chaplain to Pope Adrian VI. Erasmus, who was then living in Basel, expressed his fear that the tension between reform-minded and traditional Catholics might end in open conflict. In the Netherlands things had not yet come to blows, although Nicolaes Baechem of Egmond and Frans van der Hulst had treated some men disgracefully. As an example Erasmus mentioned the case of Hoen, "an excellent man they tell me", who had been dragged by a trick into a dungeon and there accused of heresy. The only reason, Erasmus continued, why Hoen was regarded as a heretic was his daring to dispute with Nicolas of Egmond, Erasmus's bête-noire. The dignitaries of Holland, however, had set Hoen free immediately.[20] In a letter to Erasmus dated 5 November 1523, Nicolaas van Broeckhoven of 's-Hertogenbosch (who had been imprisoned by the Inquisition in February 1522, along with his friend Cornelius Grapheus, and had recanted) confirmed Hoen's return to The Hague and his reinstatement, "to the fury of Baechem and his crew".[21] In a letter to Abel Colster (councillor of the Court of Holland from 1503–1510 and from 1516–1534) of April 1533 Erasmus again remembered Hoen and recalled what had happened to him some ten years earlier.[22] In 1525, however, Erasmus wrote a letter to Barbier which suggests that the former's acquaintance with Hoen should not be exaggerated. He wrote that Karlstadt was distributing books on the Eucharist which defended the view that only bread and wine, and not Christ's body and blood, were present on the

[20] Allen, ep. 1358.26–31: "Cornelius Hoen, vir optimus, vt audio, fuerat restitutus per aulam. Eum arte retraxerant in arcem quandam: ibi conuicissent illum haereseos—nam hic Ecmondanus felicius argumentatur quam in scholis—verum ilico liberatus est per Hollandiae proceres. Hic haereticus erat, quod ausis sit cum Ecmondano disputare." The Cornelius mentioned in the following sentence is the Antwerp humanist Cornelius Grapheus. It must be ascribed to an incorrect reading of this passage when it is stated in some biographical lexica that in 1523 Hoen was arrested after a disputation with a Benedictine monk from the abbey of Egmond; cf. 'Hoen', in RGG^3, vol. II, p. 411 and *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Lexikon*, 16. Lieferung, p. 933. On Nicolaas Baechem, see the lemma by Marjorie O'Rourke Boyle in *Contemporaries of Erasmus* I, pp. 81–83 and Erika Rummel, *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics*, 2 vols. Bibliotheca Humanistica et Reformatorica, 45 (Nieuwkoop, 1989), I, pp. 135–143.

[21] Allen, ep. 1394.10–12: "Scribonius restitutus est; restitutus est et Cornelius Hoon, aduocatus in Haga Comitis, frementibus Egmondano cum suis."

[22] Allen, ep. 2800.66: "Quid acciderit Cornelio Hoen, ipsi melius nostis."

altar. It was not only Zwingli's writings and a treatise by Oecolampadius which expressed this opinion, but also a letter, written "four years ago" by a *Batauus* and now edited anonymously. Erasmus is clearly referring to Hoen's *Epistola christiana*, but does not mention his name. Perhaps he was unaware of the identity of the *Batauus* (the identification given on the title-page of Hoen's treatise).[23] According to Walther Köhler, however, Erasmus only pretended not to know the author's name; Köhler believed that Erasmus was in fact the original addressee of Hoen's epistle and that his embarrassment over its contents made him adopt this position.[24]

Although other direct references to Hoen in Erasmus's correspondence are lacking, one more letter deserves consideration. P.S. Allen believed that a passage in a letter from the Louvain professor Martinus Dorpius (1485–1525) to Erasmus of November 1519 may refer to Hoen. Dorpius was then in The Hague visiting his elderly father, and enjoyed the protection of Nicolas Everardi. In his letter he expressed his sincere loyalty to Erasmus who was—as was Dorpius himself—facing Louvain's hostility towards the new learning. Dorpius's introductory lecture (*Oratio*) on the study of the epistles of St Paul had just been published (Antwerp, September 1519) and it was only after his return to Louvain, where he met with renewed hostility, that he would slow down his scholarly activities and express a longing for tranquillity from theological disputes. In the letter to Erasmus, however, Dorpius enthusiastically noted that both Erasmus and Luther were held in high regard by several members of the Court of Holland. Everardi, who admired Erasmus immensely, was very pleased with Dorpius's *Oratio*; his oration 'De vita Christo Domino instituenda' (now lost), delivered before several members of the Court of Holland, had met with general approval.[25] Among Erasmus's admirers at the court, apart from Everardi, Dorpius mentioned by name Gerrit, Lord of Assendelft and Heemskerk (ca. 1487–1558) and Master Jacob Mauritszoon; he also listed, among those devoted to biblical humanism, Meinard Man, the abbot of Egmond, and his own father, Bartolomeus (Mees) Hendrik-

[23] Allen, ep. 1621.18–20: "Batauus quidam ante annos quattuor aegit idem epistola, sed sine nomine, quae nunc excusa est."

[24] Walther Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther: Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl nach seinen politischen und religiösen Beziehungen* I, pp. 154–155. Köhler's arguments and the question of the original addressee are discussed more elaborately below, chapter IV.

[25] See De Vocht, *Monumenta Humanistica Lovaniensia*, pp. 218–219.

szoon van Dorp.[26] Writing about Luther's popularity in The Hague, Dorpius mentions "a man well-known as a scholar, a gifted mind and a tireless worker, still in the prime of his life, who once lived at Louvain with a great reputation for learning, who has written in support of him [Luther], expounding and defending everything on a solid basis of Holy Scripture. I have read the book myself, and will bring it with me; that is his own wish. He is a man of high spirit, and rich." Allen believed that this man may have been Hoen.[27] Gerardus Geldenhouwer did indeed list Hoen among those who wrote *in causa Lutheri*.[28] Although such a treatise—which cannot possibly be Hoen's treatise on the Eucharist—has not come down to us, this statement seems to support Allen's conjecture. But the fact that Dorpius wrote that this man was in his prime in 1519 undermines Allen's suggestion; Hoen must have been about eighty years old then.[29]

---

[26] On the Lord of Assendelft, see H.F.K. van Nierop, *Van ridders tot regenten: de Hollandse adel in de zestiende en de eerste helft van de zeventiende eeuw* (2nd ed.; Amsterdam, 1990), pp. 74–77 and *sparsim*. It is worthy of note that in the period 1521–1523 Hoen was Meinard Man's lawyer in a dispute between the abbey and the city of Alkmaar; see BH 355 (listed *infra*, note 47) and J. Hof, 'Geding tussen de abdij van Egmond en de magistraat van Alkmaar over het tiendrecht (1513–1531)', *Alkmaars jaarboekje* 6 (1970) 61–66. On Man, see G.N.M. Vis, 'Egmond en zijn bronnen', in G.N.M. Vis, M. Mostert and P.J. Margry, edd., *Heiligenlevens, Annalen en Kronieken: Geschiedschrijving in middeleeuws Egmond*. Egmondse studiën, 1 (Hilversum, 1990), pp. 9–21, at p. 13 and the literature cited there.

[27] Allen, ep. 1044.69–74: "Lutherio, quod nuper scripsi tibi, mirifice hic fauetur. Est vir quidam nominatae doctrinae, magno ingenio ac studio indefatigabili, virenti etiamnum aetate, qui Louanii olim summa cum laude eruditionis vixit, qui in eius defensionem scripsit, explicans defendensque vniuersa solidis Scripture locis. Ipse libellum legi, et afferam mecum; ita enim vult ipse, vir magno animo ac diues." For the text of Dorpius's inaugural oration, see Martinus Dorpius, *Orationes IV*, J. IJsewijn, ed. (Leipzig, 1986), pp. 61–104; on Dorpius, see J. IJsewijn, 'Martinus Dorpius', in *Contemporaries of Erasmus* I, pp. 398–404.

[28] *Collectanea van Gerardus Geldenhauer Noviomagus*, p. 138. Geldenhauer wrote that he himself had seen the books he listed as written *in causa Lutheri*: "Horum quos hic adnotaui scripta vidi" (p. 139).

[29] Allen would not exclude the possibility that a letter of Erasmus of December 1520, written at Louvain, was addressed to Hoen; see Allen, ep. 1166 (introduction). In his analysis of its contents, Allen sketched a portrait of its recipient and stated that Hoen was among the individuals who satisfied these conditions, "but the evidence is not sufficient to confirm such conjecture". Erasmus's letter was addressed to a man of position who was familiar with Dorpius and with whom Erasmus had not yet corresponded. This man was interested in affairs in the northern parts of the Netherlands, could be trusted to be discreet and was sympathetic to Luther. As Dorpius's father was from 1510 a councillor and alderman of The Hague and thus formed part of the same social and cultural elite as Hoen in a modest town like The Hague, Martinus Dorpius and Hoen must have known each other well. Albert Hardenberg's *Vita Wesseli* presupposes this

Hoen's interest in the humanities is further confirmed in a statement by Margaret of Austria. In 1523 she typified Hoen as a learned and devout man with a good reputation in life and in conversation, who generously gave alms to the poor.[30]

Finally, additional information about Hoen's humanist inclinations is provided by Aurelius's letters to Hoen of 1524. Aurelius (ca. 1460–1531)[31] was an Augustinian canon who gained some reputation as a historian and poet. He had studied at Cologne, Louvain and Paris and afterwards stayed alternately at the monastery of St Maartensdonk (an isolated cloister near Schoonhoven, belonging to the Sion Congegration) and at the monastery of St Hieronymusdal (or Lopsen), near Leiden. An adherent of the Modern Devotion on the one hand, he was open to humanist criticism on the other, especially in his *Divisiekroniek*.[32] In 1522/1523, in a treatise dedicated to the only Dutch pope, Adrian VI (1522–1523), he openly criticized certain ecclesiastical abuses and was suspected of heterodox leanings.[33] He ran foul of his superiors, who sentenced him to isolation at St Maartensdonk and barred him from all verbal or written contact. Although in 1524 he was again free to travel, it was not until a year later that he was allowed to return to Lopsen. During his confinement at Donk, Aurelius addressed three letters to Hoen, a treatise on the virtue of patience and a *vita* of their joint namesake, St Cornelius.[34]

---

relationship. The other conditions fit Hoen as well: as an advocate before the Court of Holland he was a man of position and his sympathy for Luther is revealed by his treatise on the Eucharist. But it is not possible to be definite on this point; neither would this letter, if Hoen could indeed be established as its recipient, add totally new details to Hoen's portrait. It would, however, indicate that Hoen's sympathy for Erasmus was accompanied by personal acquaintance.

[30] Fredericq IV, no. 125 (p. 180).

[31] On Aurelius's life, see Tilmans, *Historiography and Humanism in Holland in the Age of Erasmus*, pp. 9–76.

[32] See Robert Fruin, 'De samensteller van de zogenaamde Divisie-kroniek' (1888), in Fruin, *Verspreide geschriften* VII (The Hague, 1903), pp. 66–72; Fruin convincingly argued that Aurelius must have been the compiler of the *Divisie-kroniek*.

[33] The work is entitled *Apocalipsis et visio mirabilis super miserabili statu matris ecclesiae* (1522/1523) and was edited by Burman, *Hadrianus VI siue analecta*, pp. 259–314; Aurelius's autograph is kept at Leiden, University Library, Vulcanius 66, ff. 1overso–4overso.

[34] Leiden, University Library, Vulcanius 66, ff. 1–3, 43–71. See [P.C. Molhuysen,] *Bibliotheca Universitatis Leidensis. Codices Manuscripti* I: *Codices Vulcaniani* (Leiden, 1910), pp. 29–30. This codex consists of four parts which were later united; see P.C. Molhuysen, 'Cornelius Aurelius', NAK 2 (1903) 1–35, at p. 20. The first to have drawn attention to the importance of this manuscript for Hoen's biography was A. Eekhof, 'Zwingli in Holland', *Zwingliana* 3 (1918–1919) 371–384, at p. 371; see also Eekhof's con-

His first letter, dated between 14 January and 29 September 1524,[35] accompanied a collection of treatises. Aurelius asked his friend to have them printed at a convenient time by the Delft printer Cornelis Henrici (= Cornelis Heynricz. Lettersnyder). He requested that Hoen do him the favour Lucinius had done for Jerome.[36] Lucinius had sent six notaries to Bethlehem to transcribe all the works Jerome had dictated up to that point, in order to rescue them from oblivion. Lucinius acted well, for soon after 'heretics', equipped with authoritative imperial letters, had entered Jerome's study and destroyed his library. Fearing that what had happened to Jerome might happen to him too, Aurelius appealed to Hoen, dispelling in advance Hoen's possible objection: *quid Cornelius ad Hieronymum?* Nothing, Aurelius humbly answered, but, he added, everybody loves his monkeys as his own children, in the same way that a peacock loves its children, and in the temple of God any offering is welcome. But accommodatingly he presented himself to Hoen both as Jerome and as Lucinius, that is, as *dictator* and as *notarius*. He had decided to collect in one codex all the works he had written and to send them to Hoen with the request that he preserve them and have them printed in due course. (In fact, this letter precedes the manuscript volume as it still exists today; on its cover the words *Magistro Cornelio Hoen* are written in Aurelius's hand.)[37]

Aurelius's reason for choosing Hoen to fulfil this task is equally interesting. He confessed that he knew no-one who was more suited

---

tribution to *NNBW* VI (Leiden, 1924), pp. 787–788. So far, Eekhof's hint has not been followed up. On St Cornelius (d. 253), see David Hugh Farmer, *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints* (2nd ed.; Oxford–New York, 1987), pp. 100–101.

[35] Burman, *Hadrianus VI siue analecta*, pp. 247–250.

[36] Aurelius described these events in the last chapter of his *Vita gloriosi Jheronimi, doctoris ecclesie eximii et zelatoris precipui*, kept at Deventer, Stads- or Athenaeum Library, I.32, ff. 25–148 (no autograph). See also Karin Tilmans, 'Erasmus and Aurelius and Their Lives of Jerome: A Study of Cooperation and Dependence', in Alexander Dalzell, Charles Fantazzi and Richard J. Schoeck, edd., *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Torontonensis: Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies*. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 86 (Binghamton, N.Y., 1991), pp. 755–765. For St Jerome and Lucinius, see St Jerome, *Epistulae*, 3 vols. (CSEL 44–46), ep. 75,4.

[37] An edition of Aurelius's treatises, however, did not appear. Later these treatises were kept in the rich and famous library of Master Jan Dircsz. van der Haar, who in 1531 sold his library to the Court of Holland. The Leiden professor Bonaventura Vulcanius (1538–1614) obtained them from the court's library and after his death they were bought by Leiden University Library. See J.L. van der Gouw, 'De Librye van den Hove van Holland', *Het Boek* 29 (1948) 117–130 and M.E. Kronenberg, 'Werken van Cornelius Aurelius (Donckanus) in de bibliotheek van kanunnik Mr. Jan Dircsz. van der Haer (A° 1531)', *Het Boek* 36 (1963–1964) 69–79.

to it and then enumerated some of Hoen's moral and intellectual virtues: Hoen was an advocate of the poor and a liberal alms-giver; moreover, his diction was polite, his knowledge exceptional and his love unique. Intellectually, Hoen was a keen and penetrating student of the humanities, devoting as much time to this study as he could spare from his busy public activities (as Aurelius had once been told by 'our Erasmus').

Following this praise Aurelius recalled that he had already felt close to Hoen before he had made his acquaintance, because they were each other's namesake and because of Hoen's tribulations for Christ's sake. They met at St Agnes chapel at The Hague on 19 January 1524 (*ipso Pontiani die*) and after that Aurelius liked to compare their relationship to the very close bonds between the Israelite king David and his friend Jonathan. Receive then, Aurelius urged, these works as if they were your own children and deal with them for the benefit of the church, "which you love uniquely and respect highly, for the gracefulness of which you have been treated so disgracefully". Aurelius held out the prospect that at St Michael's feast he would send some more treatises by way of a nephew: lives of the apostles he had written at the request of Martinus Dorpius and some other men from Louvain.[38] Signing as a bachelor of theology, Aurelius finally called Hoen "the other part of my heart".

The second letter from Aurelius to Hoen contained in the codex precedes his treatise *De patientia*.[39] It is a letter of consolation describing the origin, nobility, efficiency and usefulness of the virtue of patience. Although Hoen, according to Aurelius, is widely held in high esteem because of his erudition and his expertise as a lawyer, it is his patience which has made him famous. In spite of all his tribulations and sufferings in prison, his patience had not deserted him and as a consequence he had persevered and eventually had been restored to his previous dignities.

Aurelius next tells a witty story about what happened to him in Delft at a festive dinner the day after he had left Hoen. Someone—"a wolf in sheep's clothing"—had urged Aurelius to give his frank opinion of Luther. Aurelius answered with a pun on Luther's name: in his opinion, Luther was that *luter* (washbasin) of Old Testament times in which the

[38] These *vitae* do not seem to have come down to us; the work is listed under the *deperdita* in Tilmans, *Historiography and Humanism in Holland in the Age of Erasmus*, p. 361.

[39] See Molhuysen, 'Cornelius Aurelius', pp. 32–35.

priests washed away the stains of sacrificial blood. Likewise, Luther intended to wash away the bloody stains of ecclesiastical avarice and simony, desiring to bring the church back to its original apostolic purity. Since everyone present laughed heartily, his antagonist remained silent.

Aurelius's treatise on the virtue of patience (*Libellus de patientia*) consists of ten chapters, each of which expounds an aspect of his theme. In each chapter he regularly addresses Hoen, consoling him, urging him to persevere in his difficult situation, rhetorically answering possible objections and inciting him to uphold stoic and Christian virtues.[40]

In the seventh chapter Aurelius inserts a passage to apply his thoughts to Hoen. As, according to St Paul (ICor 12,26), all members of the Christian body suffer when one suffers, Aurelius had felt cordial sympathy with Hoen, whose legal knowledge everybody praised and whose alms and protection all the saints and poor people of Christ proclaimed. The Lord had been with Hoen in his tribulations; he had granted the prayers of the poor (for whom Hoen cared paternally) and had saved Hoen from the hands of those who wanted to destroy his soul. Like the virgin Lucia, Hoen had held his soul in patience. Hoen's persecution, moreover, had been predicted by Christ, who had foretold that his disciples would be persecuted just as he himself would be persecuted (Io 15,20). Adversity, far from being a sign of Hoen's reprobation, was a test of virtue; the harm done by impious people should benefit us, as it checks sin, probes justice and demonstrates the misery of life.[41]

---

[40] Leiden, University Library, Vulcanius 66, ff. 45recto–57verso, at ff. 46recto (twice), 47verso, 48recto, 49verso, 50recto, 50verso, 51verso, 52verso–53recto, 54verso, 55verso, 57recto.

[41] *Ibidem*, ff. 52recto–53recto: "Plurima in te compassione ferebar iuxta illud Pauli sententiam dicentis: 'Si quid patitur vnum membrum, compatuntur omnia membra' [ICor 12,26]. Quid in christiano homine et (vt verum fatear) Catholice fideli, ego christianus compaterer? Quid, ni inquam enim turpiter affligi virum plangerem cuius doctrinam et legalem et canonicam omnes predicant, cuius elemosinas et patrocinia enarrat omnis ecclesia sanctorum et pauperum Christi? Quotidie interim quo aproriabaris, ego ipse et quidem ea potissima hora, qua filium patri immolamus. Domino intimas fundebam preces, vt suis te pauperibus afflictisque restituere dignaretur. Quid multis? Exaudiuit te, qui tecum fuit in tribulatione et eripuit te, orationem pauperum suorum quos paternaliter confouere solebas, et liberauit te de manibus querentium animam tuam, quam vtique in tua patientia cum virgine Lucia possedisti. 'In patientia etenim vestra', ait Dominus, 'possidebitis animas vestras' [Lc 21,19]. Et illud: 'Si me persequti sunt, et vos persequentur' [Io 15,10]. Et Iudith vidua: 'Omes qui placuere Deo, per multas tribulationes transierunt fideles' [Idth 8,23]. 'Omnes enim', ait apostolus, 'qui pie volunt viuere in Christo Ihesu persequtionem patientur' [IITim 3,12]. Future siquidem vite gloria presentis vite incommodis comparatur. Aduersitas enim qui bonis viris obiicitur, probatio virtutis est, non indicium reprobationis, teste Thobia hic dicit:

Aurelius's letter of exhortation finally admonishes Hoen to cling to his patience, reminding him of the graces he has received and of the many fruits of a patient attitude.[42] The letter is followed by a life of their namesake, the *Vita et passio summi pontificis et martyris Cornelii* in verse.[43]

Aurelius's remarks, together with the other statements cited, indicate that Hoen was favourably disposed to the new learning and had become a fervent student of the *bonae litterae*. But what were the consequences of this intellectual attitude for his professional work and his religious convictions?

3. *Profession*

Gnapheus wrote that Hoen was a lawyer with a sterling reputation who had served his country with his counsel. Hoen was attached to the Court of Holland, which had come into being in the early fifteenth century as a result of the negotiations between the Burgundian Duke Philip the Good and Countess Jacqueline of Bavaria at the so-called "Zoen van Delft" (the Reconciliation of Delft, 1428).[44] In fact, the court was the result of a reorganization of the ducal council: the Court of Holland, Zeeland and West Friesland was a council or chamber ("camer") of, originally, nine persons, in charge of legislation, government and jurisdiction in these regions. Until 1434 the court moved around; after-

---

'Hoc pro certo habet omnis qui colit te, quod vita eius si in probatione fuerit, coronabitur. Si autem in tribulatione fuerit, liberabitur' [Tob 3,21]. 'Iuxta enim est Dominus' (ait propheta) 'hiis qui tribulatio sunt corde, et humiles spiritu saluabit' [Ps 33,19]. Preterea mala eciam que ab iniquis fideles perferunt, ipsis vtique prosunt vel ad eluenda peccata, vel ad exercitandam probandamque iusticiam, teste Augustino, vel ad commonstrandam huius vite miseram. Ferrum quippe nostre mentis ad acumen non potest peruenire veritatis nisi hoc eraserit alterius lima prauitatis. Abel enim esse rennuit quem Cayn malicia non exercet. Quid igitur, mi Corneli? Dicamus cum glorioso Christi confessore Hieronimo: 'Veniant plage, veniant omnia genera malorum, modo post plagas Christus nobis adueniat'." On Lucia, see Farmer, *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints*, p. 270.

[42] *Ibidem*, ff. 57verso–65recto.

[43] *Ibidem*, ff. 65verso–71recto.

[44] See H. de Schepper, 'De burgerlijke overheden en hun permanente kaders, 1480–1579', in *(N)AGN* V, pp. 312–349; De Blécourt and Meijers, edd., *Memorialen van het Hof (den Raad) van Holland, Zeeland en West-Friesland*, pp. i–xxi; W.G.Ph.E. Wedekind, *Bijdrage tot de kennis van de ontwikkeling van de procesgang in civiele zaken voor het Hof van Holland in de eerste helft van de zestiende eeuw* (Assen, 1971). R. Huybregt wrote a concise and clear entry on the court in the *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*, edited by the Koninklijk Zeeuwsch Genootschap der Wetenschappen, 3 vols. (Middelburg, 1982–1984), II, p. 55.

wards, it settled at the count's castle at The Hague (*Binnen- en Buitenhof*). The court's activities and its legal proceedings were regulated by a number of instructions. In the first instance it was competent in a number of cases explicitly mentioned in these instructions, and on appeal it was competent to pass judgement on decisions made by municipal judges and rural colleges in civil law cases. The court consisted of a president (who replaced the *stadholder*) and eleven councillors. Other officials were the clerk of the court, three secretaries, the treasurer, the servants of the writ (*agent van de exploiten*), many clerks and bailiffs, and lawyers and solicitors. One of these lawyers in the period until 1524 was Cornelis Hoen.

No pleas have survived in the archives of the Court of Holland.[45] But another source of information has come down to us. There was one more possibility for appeal after the court had passed judgement, namely an appeal to the Grand Council at Malines, and the legal documents of these appeals from Holland, which were transported to Malines in bags, have survived.[46] As a result, thirty pleas and consultations by Hoen have come down to us.[47] These legal documents do not contain extensive judicial argumentations; commonly, the arguments consist of references and appeals to privileges and facts. It was only after 1520 that citations from legal authors ('doctrine') began to appear; until then references to Roman and canon law (*le droit savant*;

[45] All loose documents from before 1572 have been lost.

[46] Brussels, General State Archives, Archives of the Grand Council of Malines, Appeals from Holland. The records of this archive are on microfilm in 'Het Gravensteen', the Institute for the History of Law at Leiden; I have worked from these microfilms. Otto D.M.F. Vervaart kindly drew my attention to two (undated) *consilia* by Everardi, in which a *magister* Cornelius Henrici is mentioned. This Henrici is party in a process for some municipal office in Dordrecht, but is mentioned as the fiancé of a certain Barbara, while Hoen's wife was called Margriet or Maritgen. For this reason, I would not identify this Henrici with Cornelis Hoen. See *Responsa siue consilia D. Nicolae Everardi* (Louvain: Sassen and Birckmann, 1544), nos. 66 and 75 (pp. 217–218 and pp. 233–235).

[47] See Alain Wijffels, *Qui millies allegatur: Les allégations du droit savant dans les dossiers du Grand Conseil de Malines (causes septentrionales, ca. 1460–1580)*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1985), vol. II, p. 89; to this list of records should be added BH 355a and BH 654B (the abbreviation 'BH' stands for 'Beroepen van Holland' that is, Appeals from Holland). A full enumeration of legal documents by Hoen as preserved in the Archives of the Grand Council is: BH 254 e, BH 254 D, BH 254 I, BH 255 o, BH 255 A, BH 256 d, BH 257 e, BH 257f., BH 257 g, BH 257 j, BH 257 k, BH 294 B, BH 294 C, BH 294 E, BH 303 B, BH 303 E, BH 318 B, BH 318 C, BH 318 D, BH 318 H, BH 318 FF, BH 355 a, BH 355 s, BH 355 x, BH 355 ee, BH 421 A, BH 654 B, BH 654 C, BH 672 c, BH 754 a.

Gelehrtes Recht; *het geleerde recht*) are relatively rare.[48] The legal documents by Hoen are in complete agreement with this general picture. In his legal opinions and pleas, running to 180 pages, Hoen makes fifty appeals to Roman and canon law, but thirty-five of them figure in a five-page judicial consultation composed by Hoen together with his colleague Johannes van Baersdorp in March 1524(!).[49] The appeals comprise seventeen references to the codex,[50] sixteen to the digests,[51] two to the *Authentica 'Navigia'* (ad C. 6,2,18),[52] two to the *Glossa*,[53] two to Bartolus de Saxoferrato's commentaries,[54] one to Alexander de Imola's (Tartagnus's) commentary on Bartolus,[55] one to Jean Faure's (Johannes Faber's) commentary on the Institutes;[56] there is one reference to Gregory IX's Decretals,[57] two to the *Liber Sextus*,[58] two to the *Clementinae*,[59] one to Innocent IV's commentary on the Decretals[60] and three to Nicolas de Tudeschis's (Panormitanus's) commentary on the Decretals.[61] A citation from another source should be added to this list. In his travel diary (*Prothocolle*), the Amsterdam town secretary Andries Jacobszoon kept a detailed record of his actions and negotiations on behalf of the

---

[48] See Wijffels, *Qui millies allegatur* I, pp. 272–282 and *Idem*, '*Mos italicus* in der Anwaltspraxis des Grossen Rates zu Mecheln und des Hofes von Holland (ca. 1460–1580)', in H. de Schepper, ed., *Höchste Gerichtsbarkeit im Spätmittelalter und der frühen Neuzeit* (Amsterdam, s.d. [1985]), pp. 105–123.

[49] This consultation is BH 421 A; a transcription with a localization of all allegations was published by Alain Wijffels in Werkgroep Grote Raad (J.Th. de Smidt, M.G.M. de Jong-Snep, J.M.I. Koster-van Dijk and A. Wijffels), 'Slotens verzet zet geen zoden aan de Spaarndammerdijk', in C. Streefkerk and S. Faber, edd., *Ter recognitie: opstellen aangeboden aan Prof. Mr. H. van der Linden bij zijn afscheid als hoogleraar in de Nederlandse rechtsgeschiedenis aan de Vrije Universiteit* (Hilversum, 1987), pp. 265–274, at pp. 271–274.

[50] BH 257 e (4): C.10,42,9, C.10,39,3, C.11,8,11; BH 294 B (3): C.2,21,5; BH 318 D (2): C.10,25,2; BH 355 s (12): C.1,19,2; BH 421 A (3–7): C.4,32,26,1 (twice), C.5,20,1, C.10,25 (twice), C.10,25,2 (five times), C.11,75,4.

[51] BH 257 e (4): D.30,1,39,5 (?); BH 257 g (1): D.50,1,34; BH 355 s (12): D.43,8,2,16; BH 421 A (3–7): D. 8,4,13,1, D. 11,1,22, D.21,2,17, D.39,3,1,23, D.39,3,2,pr.? (twice), D.39,3,2,3, D.41,3,49, D.43,8,2,16, D. 44,3,7, D.47,12,3; BH 672 c (12): D.41,2,23 and D.4,6,30.

[52] BH 421 A (3–7).

[53] BH 421 A (3–7): glossa 'abrogentur' ad D.1,3,32,1 and glossa 'desuetudine' to Inst., 'Imperatorem maiestatem', §5.

[54] BH 257e (4): Bartolus ad D.50,1,34; BH 421 A (3–7): Bartolus ad C.8,52,2.

[55] BH 257 e (4): Alexander de Imola on Bartolus ad D.50,1,34.

[56] BH 318 FF (1): Johannes Faber ad I.4,6,2.

[57] BH 421 A (3–7): X.1,4,1.

[58] BH 421 A (3–7): Sextus 1,4,1 (twice).

[59] BH 421 A (3–7): *Clementinae* 1,3,7 (twice).

[60] BH 318 FF (1): Innocentius IV ad X.1,5,4.

[61] BH 421 A (3–7): Nicolaus de Tudeschis ad X.1,4,11 and ad X.2,29,2 (twice).

city of Amsterdam[62] and in December 1522–January 1523 he reported that a certain Dirck Barent had been accused of sodomy ('bougerie').[63] On his behalf, Jacobszoon travelled to The Hague to obtain advice from Cornelis Hoen. On this occasion Hoen stated that in his opinion Dirck Barent could not be discharged, referring to the well-known legal rule *nemo auditur propriam turpitudinem allegans*, which means that a person alleging his own infamy is not to be heard.[64] According to Jacobszoon, Hoen more specifically supported his argument with a reference to St Jerome in a legal work by Pope Eugene: *iuxta illud Jheronimi ad Eugeniem [Eugenium] papam de muliere septies percussa*.[65]

Although Hoen was part of a circle of lawyers and councillors with outspoken sympathy for Erasmus and his ideas (some of them—notably Nicolaas Everardi—also corresponded with him)[66] and though Hoen had studied Erasmus's works and integrated one of the latter's philological remarks into his treatise on the Eucharist, this openness to the humanist approach did not result in a marked departure from conventional jurisprudence. However, the lack of any influence of the new learning on Hoen's legal practice is not surprising. Legal humanism only crossed the Alps in the 1520s and 1530s when, at the universities in southern France, jurists like Alciatus and Pierre de l'Estoile broke

---

[62] Amsterdam, Municipal Archives (Gemeentearchief), Archief burgemeesters 5029, nr. 72: *Prothocolle van alle de reysen, te peyne waerde omme bescreven te werden, bij mij Andries Jacopsz. gedaen zedert ick de stede van Amstelredamme gedient heb gehadt, welcke dienst begon den XIIIden Novembris anno XVcXXII (tot den XVIIIden Januarij XVcXXXIX)* (two vols.). See P. Scheltema, *Amsterdamsche archief* III (Amsterdam, 1874), p. 29 (nr. 52).

[63] See Edmond Huguet, *Dictionnaire de la langue française du seizième siècle*, 7 vols. (Paris, 1925–1967; repr. Geneva, 1989), vol. I, pp. 645–647; E. Verwijs and J. Verdam, edd., *Middelnederlandsch woordenboek*, 11 vols. (The Hague, 1855–1952), I, p. 147, *s.v.* "buggere" (bugger) and "buggerie".

[64] C.7,8,5 and 8,55,4; see Detlef Liebs, ed., *Lateinische Rechtsregeln und Rechtssprichwörter* (Munich, 1982), pp. 128–129; R. Feenstra, 'Nemo auditur suam turpitudinem allegans', in J.E. Spruit and M. van de Vrugt, edd., *Brocardica in honorem G.C.J.J. van den Bergh: 22 studies over oude rechtsspreuken* (Deventer, 1987), pp. 31–36, and Augustinus Barbosa and Otto Tabor, *Thesaurus locorum communium iurisprudentiae* (6th ed., Cologne, 1737), pp. 409–410 (= lib. XVIII, cap. 37, art. V). See also D. 12.5.8. and D. 24.1.6.

[65] *Prothocolle van alle de Reysen* […] *bij mij Andries Jacops gedaen*, vol. I, fol. 4. No decretal "de muliere septies percussa" by Pope Eugenius III has been transmitted, neither is this reference taken from St Jerome's *Epistulae*, nor should it be interpreted as a proof of Hoen's humanist learning (as Tracy, *Holland under Habsburg Rule, 1506–1566*, p. 153, writes): the *Decretum* is full of references to St Jerome's writings. On the juridical approach to homosexuality, see J. Boswell, *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality* (Chicago, 1980).

[66] See Allen, epp. 1092, 1186, 1188, 1238, 1469, 1653 (Nicolaas Everardi), ep. 2645 (Gerrit van Assendelft), ep. 2734 (Joost Sasbout), ep. 2800 (Abel Coulster).

new ground.[67] Still, Nicolaas Everardi has been labelled a humanist jurist and seemingly rightly so: apart from his close contacts with Erasmus (who sent him a medal with his portrait made by Quinten Metsys),[68] he referred to his highly admired model as *magnus ille Erasmus*, while he also knew Rudolf Agricola's *De inventione dialectica* and referred to the German humanist jurist Ulrich Zasius. Nevertheless, his principal works, the *Consilia* and the *Loci legales*, are not innovative, but practical, systematically arranging the prevailing method (the *mos italicus*, in contrast to the humanist *mos gallicus*) to meet the demands of contemporary juridical practice. The characterization of Everardi as a humanist jurist was perhaps born of the desire to find a Dutch representative comparable to the foreign triumvirate of humanist jurists: Guillaume Budé of France, the Italian Alciatus and Ulrich Zasius from Germany.[69]

4. *Religious dissent: the Delft–The Hague circle*

In marked contrast to the lack of influence Hoen's humanist training had on his legal activities, his indebtedness to the new learning was one of the sources of his dissent in religious affairs. As is well-known, a distinct group of humanist scholars—mostly labelled 'biblical', 'evangelical' or 'Christian' humanists, or, alternately, 'humanist Christians'—came to apply the philological approach of their classical studies to the text of the Bible.[70] Using a purely grammatical and historical interpretation of the text in order to establish its original and only valid interpretation, these scholars sooner or later descried discrepancies between the contents of the biblical message as they established it,

---

[67] On the influence of humanism on law, see Hans Erich Troje, 'Die Literatur des gemeinen Rechts unter dem Einfluss des Humanismus', in Helmut Coing, ed., *Handbuch der Quellen und Literatur der neueren europäischen Privatrechtsgeschichte* II/1 (Munich, 1977), pp. 615–795.

[68] Allen, ep. 1092; see also J. Huizinga, *Erasmus* (1924), in Huizinga, *Verzamelde Werken* VI (Haarlem, 1950), pp. 3–194, at p. 186.

[69] See Alain Wijffels, '*Iudicium time*', *Rechtshistorisches Journal* 3 (1984) 169–174. On Everardi, see also René Dekkers, *Het Humanisme en de Rechtswetenschap in de Nederlanden* (Antwerp, 1938), pp. 1–36; L.J. van Apeldoorn, *Nicolaes Everaerts (1462–1532) en het recht van zijn tijd* (Amsterdam, 1939) and the entry by C.M.G. ten Raa in *Nationaal Biografisch Woordenboek* 7 (Brussels, 1977), pp. 214–231.

[70] See J. IJsewijn, 'Humanism in the Low Countries', in Albert Rabil, ed., *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, 1988), II, pp. 156–215.

and current dogma and contemporary ecclesiastical institutions. Only rarely did their critical approaches radicalize into a breach with the medieval church; more often their attitude crystallized into more or less clearly defined programmes of reform within the traditional church. Their uneasy position might end in 'Nicodemism' or lead to (voluntary) exile. In the early 1520s a group of humanist dissidents—including Hoen—assembled in The Hague and Delft. The other members were Gulielmus Gnapheus (Willem Claesz. van de Voldersgraft), rector of the Latin school at The Hague; Fredericus Canirivus (Frederik Hondebeke), rector of the Delft Latin school; Ioannes Sartorius, *gymnasiarch* at Amsterdam, and the priest Ioannes Pistorius (Jan de Bakker van Woerden). To these names should be added Hinne Rode, the rector of the Utrecht Hieronymus school, Pistorius's tutor and the person who maintained the contacts between this group of evangelical dissidents and foreign centres of reform.

The extent of their organization is not clear. But any description of this group as "the first reformed congregation"[71] in the Netherlands is, of course, unjustifiably far-fetched, if only because such a characterization presupposes an organizational breach with the Catholic church, which at that time was out of the question. Rather we can assume that these people met regularly to discuss scholarly and religious questions. In fact, their forming a group is suggested by the circumstances of their coming from the same region and being fellow prisoners in the early 1520s; in addition, one of them (Gnapheus) wrote a report about the trial of one of the others (Pistorius) and in 1529 dedicated his play about the prodigal son to another of them (Sartorius), while in 1541 he memorialised Hoen in an *epitaph*. Sartorius, in return, dedicated his *Grammatica* to Gnapheus. Which topics were under discussion and what ideas were expressed by this elite group of reformers? Answers to these questions can be derived from the fragmentary records of their trials and from a few other sources. Pistorius's opinions are revealed in the description of his trial by Gnapheus; theological disputations formed the core of it. Though the Latin chronicle of these discussions was only published in 1546, it evidently describes events that took place in 1525.[72]

---

[71] See especially De Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland*, p. 83 and L. Knappert, *Het Ontstaan en de Vestiging van het Protestantisme*, pp. 115–116, 137–161.

[72] *Johannis Pistorii a Worden ob euangelicae doctrinae assertionem apud Hollandos primo omnium exusti, vita, per Gulielmum Gnapheum Hagiensem anno M.D.XXV. conscripta, sed nunc primum a quodam pietatis studioso in lucem edita* (Strasbourg: Wendelin Rihel, 1546); partly reprinted in Fredericq IV, no. 378 (pp. 406–452). Gnapheus's prologue is dated 1 December 1529

Gnapheus's own convictions are expressed in his treatise *Mirror and Consolation of the Sick*. The first known edition was not published earlier than 1531,[73] but the prologue of a later edition clearly states that the treatise was composed at the time of the Peasants' War in Germany (1525) and that it appeared in print, without Gnapheus's knowledge or collabora-

---

'ex exilio nostro' (Fredericq IV, p. 408); together with a letter written from Königsberg on 14 July 1544, Gnapheus sent his martyrology of Pistorius to Ioannes a Lasco and assured him that he was free to use it deliberately and that for additional information he should turn to *Sartorius meus* who had once been his (Gnapheus's) fellow prisoner. See S.A. Gabbema, ed., *Epistolarum ab illustribus et claris viris scriptarum centuriae tres* (Harlingen, 1663), pp. 25–29, at p. 28; see also Henry de Vocht, *John Dantiscus and his Netherlandish Friends as revealed by their correspondence, 1522–1546* (Louvain, 1961), pp. 365–368, at p. 368. The Latin text was also edited by Jacobus Revius in 1649: *Joannis Pistorii Woerdenatis ob euangelicae veritatis assertionem apud Hollandos primo omnium exusti, martyrium*, Jacobus Revius, ed. (Leiden, 1649; 2nd ed. 1650; a Dutch translation by Jacob Verwey was published in 1652 and 1657); as the original edition of 1546 was inaccessible to me, I have worked in one instance (see note 273) from this edition. A Dutch version (*Een suuerlicke ende seer schone disputacie, welcke gheschiet is in den Haghe in Hollant, tusschen die kettermeesters ende eenen christelijcken priester ghenaemt Jan van Woorden, aldaer gheuanghen ende oock verbrant. Welcke questien al wel ghenoteert gheweest zijn van eenen wel gheleerden man, anno duysent vijfhondert XXV, den vijfthienden dach Septembris*; NK 1009, reprinted in Fredericq IV, nr. 379 [pp. 453–496]) was printed by Frans Fraet (Antwerp) ca. 1552–1554; see Paul Valkema Blouw, 'The Van Oldenborch and Vanden Merberghe pseudonyms *or* Why Frans Fraet had to die', *Quaerendo* 22 (1992) 165–190, 245–272, at pp. 267, 270. On the last page of this *Disputacie* the exclamation 'God, verlost die gheuanghen' ('O God, redeem the prisoners') is found, followed by the words 'By my, Peeter Stesser, alias Lodewijck Hetser'; from September 1523 this exclamation ('O Gott erlös die gefangenen') was the motto of Ludwig Hätzer's treatises (see J.F. Gerhard Goeters, *Ludwig Hätzer [ca. 1500–1529], Spiritualist und Antitrinitarier: Eine Randfigur der frühen Täuferbewegung*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte, 25 [Gütersloh, 1957], p. 26). The last part of the *Disputacie* seems to be, then, a contemporary eyewitness account of Pistorius's *martyrium*, in all probability written by Hätzer and published as a broadsheet.

[73] Gnapheus, *Een troost ende spiegel der siecken ende derghenen die in lijden zijn, wt die Heylighe Scrift by een ghevoecht ende neerstelick gecorrigeert* (Antwerp: Adriaen van Berghen, 1531). The edition listed in NK 1010 was printed by Frans Fraet (Antwerp) ca. 1552–1554, while a later edition under the title of *Tobias ende Lazarus, mit grooter nersticheydt ghecorrigeert, verbetert, ende in drie dialogos oft t'samen sprekinghe vnderscheydelicken ghedeelt, alle krancken, bedroefden ende eenuoldighe menschen seer profijtelick ende troostelick om te lesen* (Leiden, University Library: 1498 G 30) was printed by Gillis van der Erven (Emden) in 1557; see Valkema Blouw, 'The Van Oldenborch and Vanden Merberghe pseudonyms', pp. 176–181 and Pettegree, *Emden and the Dutch revolt*, pp. 268–269 (nr. 64). The text of *Een troost ende spiegel der siecken* is at hand in BRN I, pp. (137) 151–249. Gnapheus read Philippus Melanchthon's books and favoured his ideas (see Ioannes Sartorius's remark in the dedication of his *Grammatica* [1533] to Gnapheus: "sed praeter alia quae sunt quot literatores, postremum prodiit Melanchthon, eruditis certe omnibus laudatissimus, quem unum, mi Gnaphee, meis non fuissem praelegere, nisi praeter quod Melanchthonis nomen nobis aliquid atri alit, in eo me scrupuli aliquot male haberent"); the latter's influence on *Een troost ende spiegel der siecken* is, *e.g.*, apparent from his equation of Christ with his benefactions.

tion, immediately thereafter.[74] One fragmentary letter in the name of Canirivus has come down to us, written in 1522, while Sartorius's views during this period of his life may be inferred from some of his literary publications.

In his survey of the Reformation in the Low Countries, Schoockius[75] revealed that in Delft in the early 1520s a group of intellectuals favourably disposed towards reform ("ecclesia aliqua ex tenebris papanis producta") was already in existence. The torch of truth had been lit by a certain Gualterus (Wouter), a Black Friar from Utrecht who, as early as 1510, had criticized several ecclesiastical abuses "with bold frankness". Called to account by Bishop Frederik of Baden, Gualterus to some extent recanted, but no sooner had Luther stepped into the limelight in 1517 than Gualterus repeated his heretical opinions. For this reason he became known as *de Luthersche monick* (the Lutheran monk). In 1520 a ban was issued against him and Gualterus consequently fled to Delft (from where in 1528 he would flee to Strasbourg). At Delft he preached in layman's dress and told his listeners that God does not forgive sins for money, for if he did so, he would not have sent his Son to extirpate sin and death by his blood.[76] This assault by Gualterus on the practice of indulgences, as related by Schoockius, appears to be confirmed by archival sources about a Dominican *broeder Wouter uten Hage* (brother Wouter from The Hague) who from 1515 to 1521 regularly and successfully delivered sermons on the Passion of Christ in the 'Oude Kerk' (Old Church) in Delft. However, he was replaced by a Franciscan preacher, as he had become the victim of 'the hatred of the brothers from The Hague'.[77] According to Schoockius, Georgius Sylvanus and

---

[74] See *Tobias ende Lazarus* (Emden, 1557), A6recto–A6verso; see Alastair Duke, 'The Origins of Evangelical Dissent in the Low Countries', in Duke, pp. 1–28, at p. 9, note 45 and Valkema Blouw, 'The Van Oldenborch and Vanden Merberghe pseudonyms', p. 181, note 52.

[75] See p. 8, note 21.

[76] Schoockius, *Liber de bonis vulgo ecclesiasticis dictis*, pp. 479, 752. This passage was reprinted in Fredericq IV, nr. 29 (pp. 18–19); an extract in Paul Fredericq, ed., *Codex documentorum sacratissimarum indulgentiarum Neerlandicarum: verzameling van stukken betreffende de pauselijke aflaten in de Nederlanden (1300–1600)*. Rijks geschiedkundige publicatiën, kleine serie, 21 (The Hague, 1922), p. 602.

[77] See G. Verhoeven, *Devotie en negotie: Delft als bedevaartplaats in de late middeleeuwen* (Amsterdam, 1992), p. 183. In this case too, J.G. de Hoop Scheffer's authority has changed one of his suppositions into established fact. Writing about Wouter's indignation over indulgences, De Hoop Scheffer remarked that the Dominican's outrage might have been caused by the fact that early in 1520 many inhabitants of Delft

the aforementioned Gnapheus, Pistorius, Canirivus, Sartorius and Cornelius Hoen were among Gualterus's listeners.[78]

As for Georgius Sylvanus, nothing is known about his identity. In all probability Schoockius mistook him for Georgius Saganus, Rode's companion on his journey to Huldrych Zwingli and Leo Jud at Zurich in 1523/1524 (which is all we know about this enigmatic companion of Rode).[79]

Gulielmus Gnapheus (Willem Claesz. de Volder, or Van de Voldersgraft) immortalized himself through his play *Acolastus* (1529). The comedy's theme was the biblical parable of the prodigal son; it has seen 51 editions, the most recent appearing in 1964.[80] Gnapheus was born

---

went to Rotterdam, where indulgences in favour of St Laurens's church could be obtained (*Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland*, p. 83; the document De Hoop Scheffer referred to at p. 20 is printed in Fredericq, *Codex documentorum sacratissimarum indulgentiarum Neerlandicarum*, pp. 603–604). In their book on the history of the Reformation in the Low Countries, J. Reitsma and J. Lindeboom have written that Gualterus's sermons were particularly directed against the indulgences issued in favour of the completion of St Laurens's church (J. Reitsma and J. Lindeboom, *Geschiedenis van de Hervorming en de Hervormde kerk der Nederlanden* [4th ed., Utrecht, 1933], p. 86; *nota bene*: this mistake was omitted from the final fifth edition of this book published in 1949, pp. 28, 36, 37). This downward spiral of accuracy continued in a recent dissertation on the Reformation in Rotterdam, where Wouter's warnings against Rotterdam indulgences are presented as well-known facts (H. ten Boom, *De Reformatie in Rotterdam, 1530–1585* [s.l., 1987], pp. 70, 79). Verhoeven, *Devotie en negotie*, p. 183 repeats this error and refers to Ten Boom's study. Admittedly, I myself in a fit of insanity once identified Gualterus with a Wouter who in 1460 was prior of the Utrecht convent of the Black Friars (see S.P. Wolfs, *Middeleeuwse Dominicanenkloosters in Nederland: bijdrage tot een monasticon* [Assen, 1984], pp. 259, 270, 272); that he was the same person as Gualterus who in 1528 was still alive is, admittedly, highly uncertain. See B.J. Spruyt, 'Hinne Rode (ca. 1480–ca. 1539): het leven en de ontwikkeling van de dissidente Rector van het Utrechtse fraterhuis', in H. ten Boom *et alii*, edd., *Utrechters entre-deux: Stad en Sticht in de eeuw van de Reformatie, 1520–1620* (Delft, 1992), pp. 21–42, at p. 23.

[78] Schoockius, *Liber de bonis vulgo ecclesiasticis dictis*, p. 479. This group of dissidents formed the subject of the concluding pages in Oosterbaan, *De Oude kerk te Delft gedurende de Middeleeuwen*, pp. 234, 235. See also Oosterbaan, 'School en kerk in het middeleeuwse Delft (II)', pp. 112–120.

[79] See C.C. de Bruin, 'Hinne Rode', in *Het Sticht van binnen en van buijtenen: bundel opstellen […] aangeboden aan dr. M.P. van Buijtenen* (Utrecht, 1981), pp. 191–208, at p. 198, note 18. See also chapter IV, note 13.

[80] Gulielmus Gnapheus, *Acolastus*, Johannes Bolte, ed. Lateinische Literaturdenkmäler des XV. und XVI. Jahrhunderts, 1 (Berlin, 1891). At the end of his introduction, Bolte listed 48 editions of the play (pp. xxiv–xxvii), his own one being the forty-ninth. The next edition, with a Dutch translation, was published by P. Minderaa in 1956: Gulielmus Gnapheus, *Acolastus. Latijnse tekst met Nederlandse vertaling*, P. Minderaa, ed.

in The Hague in 1493;[81] he entered the arts curriculum at Cologne in 1511 and received his bachelor's degree in 1512.[82] He was ordained a priest and in 1522 is mentioned as the rector of The Hague's Latin school. Soon afterwards, however, he ran foul of the Inquisition. In the prologue to his *Tobias ende Lazarus* Gnapheus wrote movingly about his experiences. Together with Hoen he was imprisoned in 1523 as, according to Gnapheus's own interpretation, he had been unwilling to serve "Satan's kingdom of ceremonies and false religion". Both were sentenced to provisional liberty within The Hague. After two years Gnapheus was set free. He compiled a short letter to a poor and distressed widow whose son had left his monastery, arguing that the kingdom of God did not exist in the outward observance of certain prescriptions, but in faith in God and in loving our neighbour; a life of faith and love could be lived as well outside the monastery as in it. The Louvain "sophists" got hold of this letter and after his examination he was condemned in May 1525 to a penitential stay of three months in a monastery. During this period he learned of the horrible persecutions in the Netherlands and the Peasants' Revolt in Germany; in order to console the many widows and orphans as well as himself, he wrote his *Een troost ende spiegel der siecken*. Shortly after the Gelders soldiers had

---

(Zwolle, 1956). The (thus far) latest edition, accompanied by an English translation, is W.E.D. Atkinson, *Acolastus: A Latin Play of the Sixteenth Century by Gulielmus Gnapheus. Latin Text with a Critical Introduction and an English Translation* (London, Ontario, 1964). On the *Acolastus*, see the introductions to the editions mentioned, and Franz Günter Sieveke, 'Der Dialogführung im *Acolastus* des Gnaphaeus', in J. IJsewijn and E. Kessler, edd., *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Lovaniensis: Proceedings of the First International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies*. Humanistische Bibliothek I,20 (Louvain–Munich, 1973), pp. 595–601.

[81] The most recent synthesis of Gnapheus's life is Hendrik Roodhuyzen, *Het leven van Guilhelmus Gnapheus, een' der eerste hervormers van Nederland* (Amsterdam, 1858). See also T.J. Geest, 'Gulielmus Gnaphaeus (humanist-hervormer-paedagoog)', *Bijdragen voor vaderlandsche geschiedenis en oudheidkunde* VI–4 (1926) 77–96. The late Rev. G.J. Graafland of Zeist collected materials and documents for a new study, but his death in August 1992 prevented him from completing it. See, however, G.J. Graafland and J. Trapman, 'Gnapheus, Guilielmus', in BLGNP.

[82] See Karl Krafft and Wilhelm Krafft, *Briefe und Documente aus der Zeit der Reformation im 16. Jahrhundert, nebst Mittheilungen über Kölnische Gelehrte und Studien im 13. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Elberfeld, 1875), p. 192. At the University of Konigsberg in October 1544, Gnapheus was accused of teaching without having taken a university degree, 'quamquam ipse titulo magisterii gloriaretur'. Gnapheus was excused by the academic authorities as he was only *lector extraordinarius*, but they stipulated that in future no-one without a university degree would be allowed to teach. See Paul Tschackert, ed., *Urkundenbuch zur Reformationsgeschichte des Herzogthums Preussen*, 3 vols. Publicationen aus den K. Preussischen Staatsarchiven, 43–45 (Leipzig, 1890), vol. II, p. 85 (nr. 1702).

conquered and raided The Hague (March 1528), the local authorities again sounded the alarm when a piece of sausage was found in a pan of pea soup in Gnapheus's house during Lent. According to Gnapheus's ironical account of the affair, a pregnant woman (whose natural desire in that condition was for such food) had thrown the sausage into the pan, as it was too salty for her to eat it by itself. The *stadholder* and his councillors gave this incident the highest priority and postponed considerations of the county's affairs "to deliberate upon that piece of sausage" (even medical doctors were consulted about whether or not pregnant women have an appetite for sausages).

In 1528 Gnapheus was recorded as head of a school at nearby Geervliet[83] and in his absence was pronounced an outlaw. While his elderly mother and his only sister were imprisoned and his goods confiscated, Gnapheus (who refused to become a Nicodemite) fled abroad.[84]

To assess Gnapheus's convictions in the early 1520s, we should turn to his *Troost ende spiegel der siecken*. This treatise is a dialogue between Timotheus (Gnapheus), Tobias (his neighbour) and Lazarus (another neighbour who is severely ill). It mercilessly attacks the avaricious and loveless ritualism and formalism of the clergy (in the person of the local pastor); clergymen speak about the Gospel, but do not have it in their hearts or in their hands.[85] As the pastor proves unwilling to visit

---

[83] Fredericq V, p. 382.

[84] See *Tobias ende Lazarus* (Emden, 1557), A5recto: "Ick houde wel dat daer veel Nicodemissche raedtsheeren ende richteren ouer al gheuonden werden, die mit groote beswaringe der conscientien somtijden sitten moeten in den raet daer dat onschuldighe bloed der vromer christen (om der heeren placaten meer als om eenighe quaede feyten) van den leuen ter doedt verwesen werden, niet anghesien dat men in zulcken val meer schuldigh is God ghehoorzaem te zijn, dan de menschen, als Petrus zegt [Acts 4,19 and 5,29]."

In 1531 Gnapheus turned up at Elbing (East Friesland), where from 1535 till 1541 he was rector of the Latin school. From 1541 he was councillor to Duke Albert of Brandenburg at Konigsberg and inspector of the local Latin school (*Domschule*), and in 1544 he was appointed *archipaedagogus* of the university's *particularium* and *lector extraordinarius* at the university. In 1547 gnesio-lutheran die-hards, headed by Fredericus Staphylus, brought about his excommunication. Gnapheus fled back to East Friesland, where at Ioannes a Lasco's recommendation he was employed by Countess Anna as tutor to her three sons, while he also played an active role in the confiscation of ecclesiastical properties and in 1563 was one of three Emden ambassadors to work out a commercial treaty with the English administration. He died as a land agent (*rentmeester*) in Norden (Emden) on 29 September 1568. See Graafland/Trapman, 'Gnapheus, Guilielmus'.

[85] BRN I, p. 155.

Lazarus, Timotheus and Tobias—laymen—decide to fulfil the pastoral task themselves. They reveal to him that the Christian life is not a life of ceremonies in obedience to human institutions, but a life of love and mercy. The book rejects images, the Mass, pilgrimages and the adoration of the saints, and it is indignant about the clergy's habit of torturing the souls of their parishioners with the fear of eternal punishment. Instead, the "followers of the Gospel" (*wi Euangelische luden*)[86] proclaim the Word of God that speaks of peace and forgiveness.[87] The dialogue argues that prayer should be in the vernacular,[88] proclaims the independence of the laity in religious affairs,[89] and wants ecclesiastical revenues to be spent in favour of the poor and the maintenance of schools.[90] Thus far, Gnapheus's treatise reflects faithfully some of the principles of humanist evangelism.[91] His soteriological convictions, however, are more radical: Gnapheus denies free will, believes that faith is a gift of God and a living and sure experience of the heart by which the faithful know that they please God, and that God by his Son is merciful to them.[92] In a remarkable passage, apparently inspired by Luther's specific convictions on this point,[93] Timotheus teaches Lazarus how to endure his sufferings by a correct interpretation of God's conduct towards his creatures. Lazarus should bear in mind that God by his very nature is merciful, but in order to show his mercy to the faith-

[86] BRN I, p. 163.
[87] BRN I, p. 232.
[88] BRN I, p. 169.
[89] BRN I, p. 160.
[90] BRN I, p. 163.
[91] In its treatment of the Mass (BRN I, pp. 201–205), it protests against Lazarus's use of masses for his physical recovery; Gnapheus stresses that the Lord's Supper is celebrated in memory of Christ's vicarious death. In his introduction to his edition of the text, F. Pijper argued (BRN I, p. 146) that Gnapheus's view of the Eucharist was in complete accordance with Hoen's, but Gnapheus's exposition in this short passage is not specific, nor does it repeat any of Hoen's characteristic opinions. Pijper's conclusion is somewhat far-fetched.
[92] BRN I, p. 170.
[93] See Martin Luther's *Disputatio Heidelbergae habita* (1518) in StA I, pp. 186–219 (= WA I [350]353–374). In the summer of 1520 the disputation was published by the Zwolle printer Simon Corver: Martin Luther, *Thesen und Erläuterungen zur Heidelberger Disputation und Schrift über die Beichte. Einleitung zum zweiten Galaterkommentar. Gedicht auf Graf Enno II. von Ostfriesland. Drei neugefundene lateinische Drucke aus der St.-Gotthardt-Bibliothek in Brandenburg*, Konrad von Rabenau, ed. (Leipzig, 1987). For an exposition of Luther's views, see Walther von Loewenich, *Luthers Theologia crucis* (2nd ed., Munich, 1933) and W.J. Kooiman, 'Gods maskerspel in de theologie van Luther', in M.A. Beek *et alii*, *Maskerspel voor Dr. W. Leendertz* (Bussum, 1955), pp. 49–83.

ful, God first accomplishes a work alien to his nature (a reference to Is.28,21), a work which they perceive as a work of wrath and hate when he flagellates and castigates them. Through God's chastisement of them the faithful find themselves "under the cross" (*midden int cruys*) in desolation and become dead to the world. It appears to them as if God was their enemy. But faith believes things concealed to the human eye. Finally the realization comes that God vivifies man by "killing" him first, that he leads him to heaven when he seems to strike him down to the desolation of hell. God conceals his grace under his wrath; with the "eye of faith" Lazarus, therefore, should see through his illness and behold God's friendly face—he now shows the mask (*larua*) of his wrath (*larue des gramschaps*), but then he will show his sweetness.[94]

Pistorius (Jan Jansz. de Bakker van Woerden) was born the son of a sexton and baker at Woerden in 1499.[95] As a pupil at the Utrecht Hieronymus school, led by the Brethren of the Common Life, Pistorius was influenced by the rector of the Brotherhouse, Hinne Rode, who sympathized with religious dissent. His father recognized this danger and sent his son to Louvain, where Pistorius matriculated in 1519.[96] He was ordained a priest in 1522 and two years later he married Jacoba Jansd.

---

[94] BRN I, pp. 178–179. W.E.D. Atkinson and Stephen L. Wailes have argued (convincingly, in my eyes) that Gnapheus in his dramatization of the parable of the prodigal son embodied Luther's doctrine of the bondage of will. See Atkinson, *Acolastus: A Latin Play of the Sixteenth Century*, pp. 47–72 and Stephen L. Wailes, 'Is Gnapheus' *Acolastus* a lutheran play?', in Francis G. Gentry, ed., *Semper idem et novus: Festschrift for Frank Banta* (Göppingen, 1988), pp. 345–357.

[95] On Pistorius, see De Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland*, pp. 360–394 and J.W. Gunst, *Johannes Pistorius Woerdensis* (Hilversum, 1925).

[96] See Gnapheus's *Pistorii Vita* (Fredericq IV, pp. 406–452), p. 408: "Hic [in Utrecht–BJS] praeceptore utitur Joanne Rhodio, percelebri Hieronymiani collegii praefecto, viro cum docto tum pio, a quo pietatis et religionis nostrae praecepta studiose didicit, professionisque suae tyrocinia sedulo exercuit; inde adeo et cum praeceptore suo studiosus discipulus in Lutheranismi odium statim est vocatus. Coeperat enim per id tempus emergere veritas Evangelica: cui vindicando crebris in Germaniam profectionibus idem Rhodius iam tum vacabat. Pater vero optimus filio timens exitium, gliscente nimirum indies magis atque magis odiosa Lutheranismi suscipione, eum iam a ludo domum revocatum aeditui munus secum obire iussit. In quo quidem minime destitit Evangelii renascentis praeconia concivibus passim suis inculcare et multos proselytos Christo adducere. Hinc vero Lovanium missus ad capiendum ulteriorem ingenii cultem, Erasmo nostro, Batavorum gloriae et splendori, cum quo parenti optimo vetus hospitium ac summa necessitudo in adulescentia fuerat (una enim domi in literis trivialibus perdiscendis militaverunt) commendatus mirum quam brevi temporis curriculo profecerit."

van Woerden.[97] His sermons caused suspicion, but he refused to give an account of them in Utrecht; as a result, he was incarcerated in Woerden castle in 1523. Released shortly afterwards, he visited Wittenberg and after his return travelled through the county of Holland, visiting Hoen and Gnapheus in their dungeons to console them.[98] His protest against indulgences, as well as his overt confession of his disbelief in the validity of human institutions, led to his arrest in May 1525 and his incarceration in the *Voorpoort* (later he was kept in *die gheyool*, a filthy hole which one of his inquisitors, Ruardus Tapper, could not bear the stench of). His trial lasted from 11 July till 7 September 1525. His judges were Nikolaas Coppin de Montibus, Godschalck Rosemond, Ruardus Tapper and Bruno Bockes van Aytta, who were joined by two councillors, Jan van Duivenvoorde and Abel Coulster, and the president of the Great Court of Malines, Joost Lauwerijns.[99] In an illuminating analysis of Gnapheus's Latin description of Pistorius's trial, the witty historian R.C. Bakhuizen van den Brink (1810–1865) characterized the councillors of the Court of Holland as the moderate Nicodemuses and Gamaliels in the midst of the Sanhedrin (the references are to John 3, John 7,50–52, John 19,39 and to Acts 5,34–41).[100] Pistorius was pronounced guilty and, deprived of his ordination, handed over to the secular authorities. Clothed in a yellow jester's suit, he was burnt at the stake on 25 September in the presence of the regent, Margaret of Austria. Gerardus Geldenhouwer was also among the spectators.[101]

---

[97] She was many years his senior, and rather ugly; for this reason, Pistorius's judges later said in derision that he chose to die at the stake rather than return to his wife (Fredericq IV, p. 448 and p. 492).

[98] Fredericq IV, p. 409: "Ecclesiam ergo Witenbergensem in Saxoniis pietatis studio visunt; cui profectioni trimestri insumpto, in patriam redeunt […] Interea Wordenas noster a ditione Traiectensi abstinens, totam Hollandiam peragrat, fratres et ecclesias in Domino coactas passim confirmat. Qui? quam me quoque una cum Cornelio Honio iurisconsulto doctissimo, monachismi a me confutati ergo captivum, officiose apud Delphos haerentem invisit: et magnum pietatis specimen nobis commentando praebuit!"

[99] The composition of this tribunal is in accordance with the instructions given by Margaret of Austria from 3 March 1523 (Fredericq IV, no. 125 [pp. 178–180]).

[100] R.C. Bakhuizen van den Brink, 'Gnapheus' verhaal van het proces van Jan de Backer', in *Studiën en schetsen over vaderlandsche geschiedenis en letteren* V (The Hague, 1913), pp. 291–308, at p. 304.

[101] *Collectanea van Gerardus Geldenhauer Noviomagus*, pp. 78–79. (For textual corrections to Prinsen's edition of Geldenhauer's *Itinerarium*, of which the passage referred to forms a part, see Willem de Vreese, 'Een lofdicht van Geldenhauer op Erasmus', *Het Boek* 13 [1924] 337–342, at pp. 340–342.)

Pistorius is regarded as the first Protestant martyr of the (northern) Low Countries. But what, then, did he die for? In a letter-treatise on "clandestine cohabitation" and matrimony written in 1547(?), Albert Hardenberg recalled his acquaintance with Pistorius, who had been burnt only because he was a priest who had not been hypocritical enough to conceal his marriage.[102] Likewise, Gnapheus, in his apology for his fellow prisoner, elaborately argued that marriage was founded on biblical prescriptions, while celibacy was against human nature and led to immorality, changing monasteries into whorehouses.[103] For Pistorius—as becomes apparent from his interrogations—only arguments derived directly from the Bible were valid; the text of the Bible was the razor with which he excised human traditions and institutions not in accordance with its prescripts. Celibacy being unscriptural, Pistorius defended the notion of the priesthood of all believers. During the third interrogation on 12 July, however, Pistorius gave in and wrote a declaration stating that he accepted as necessary and laudable all those ecclesiastical institutions not contrary to Holy Scripture.[104] This written statement was used to trap him. Since his judges were apparently reluctant to condemn him solely on the grounds of his marriage and his defence of it, they seized on this to investigate more precisely which ecclesiastical institutions Pistorius viewed as being in accordance with the Bible or not. Ultimately, Pistorius appeared to dismiss as unscriptural fasting, the number of the church's sacraments and the eucharistic doctrine of *ex opere operato*. Rather than submitting to the authority of the church Pistorius called upon the testimony of the Holy Spirit in his heart.[105] During their final disputation on 7 September, Pistorius was given the opportunity to confess. Contrary to the expectation of

[102] See the discussion in W. Janse, *Albert Hardenberg als Theologe: Profil eines Bucer-Schülers*, pp. 152–156. Dr. Janse generously supplied xeroxes of this treatise, which is kept at Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 10351, nr. 32, ff. 125recto–131recto (the passage on Pistorius is to be found on f. 129verso).

[103] Gnapheus's apology was omitted in Fredericq IV; see p. 411. In Revius's *in octavo* edition of the text (see note 72), it covers pp. 11–71.

[104] Fredericq IV, pp. 438–439: "De constitutionibus ecclesiae id sentio, ipsas temere non esse violendas, sed vel necessarias, vel laudabiles, quatenus Dei verbo non adversantur, habendas." The Dutch version (Fredericq IV, p. 480) reads: "Ic, Jan Janszoen van Woorden, gheuoele dat van die ordinancien ende insetten der heyligher kercken, datmen niet lichtelicken of sonder [oorsaeck] die niet verwerpen en sal; maer sy zijn seer te prijsen ende tonderhouden, alsmen alleen goede vermaninghen tot profitelicheyt doet. Dit is mijn geuoelen int generael gheseyt, sonder eenighe speceficacie te maken: weest doch nu hier mede te vreden."

[105] Fredericq IV, pp. 439–441 (Dutch version: pp. 480–483).

his judges he did not enumerate his trespasses in great detail, but confined himself to confessing his total depravity, adding, however, that he was most certain about God's goodness towards him, for the Son had washed away all his sins with his blood. For this reason, priestly absolution was a matter of indifference to Pistorius.[106] All this was evidence enough to sustain the accusation that he was a "Lutheran" and sufficiently justified his burning at the stake.

Fredericus Canirivus (or Frederik Hondebeke) was rector of the Delft Latin school in the early 1520s. His biographer has characterized him as a distinguished and pious intellectual.[107] One fragmentary letter which he wrote in 1522 and addressed to Kaspar Hedio at Mainz[108] has come down to us. In it Canirivus bitterly complains about the many *Nicodemi* in his place of residence. An apparently conscious opponent of Catholic worship whose tasks, moreover, included giving sermons to his pupils on Sundays and holidays (an apt medium through which to exercise influence), Canirivus sharply contrasted his own zeal and success in openly preaching against the *res monachorum* with the attitude of Erasmus. Erasmus—according to Canirivus—was now cooling down and secretly retracting what he used to say or write more overtly. Both Erasmus and the Delft Nicodemites did not dare, out of childish fear, to persist in the public confession of their inner convictions. They were more concerned with the honour of people than with God's. Canirivus called for patience and fortitude till the time when God would help; he pretended not to help but he would show his support at the moment when human resources were completely exhausted. God alone works among men and thus only to him all honour belongs. Canirivus, therefore, was sure about the outcome; to those who are more steadfast it will be given to proclaim the glory of Christ, who alone strengthens easily discouraged consciences.[109]

---

[106] Fredericq IV, pp. 443–446 (Dutch version: pp. 488–493).

[107] Oosterbaan, 'School en kerk in het middeleeuwse Delft', pp. 112–120 has treated Canirivus exhaustively.

[108] Note that Hedio was also acquainted with Hinne Rode; see Hedio's letter of 21 May 1523 to Wolfgang Capito, cited and discussed on p. 210.

[109] Canirivus's letter was first published by Abraham Scultetus, *Annalium euangelii passim per Europam decimo quinto salutis partae seculo renouati decas prima, ab anno M.D.XVI. ad annum M.D.XXVI.* (Heidelberg, 1618), p. 136. Since Fredericq IV, no. 78 (pp. 114–115) edited only a fragment and Oosterbaan's edition appeared in a journal difficult to access, I give the text here (Oosterbaan, 'School en kerk in het middeleeuwse Delft', p. 113):

In May 1523 two officials of the Court of Holland stayed in Delft to obtain information "about a certain schoolmaster who had ventured to say and teach various opinions of an heretical nature and contrary to the holy Christian faith".[110] Canirivus was interrogated and the city magistrates were questioned about their policy towards heresy. In August the magistrates, who saw their privileges threatened, resisted efforts by the regent and Van der Hulst to transport Canirivus (and Hoen) to Gorinchem for further investigation about their relationship to the "Lutheran sect".[111] In September 1523 Canirivus was a prisoner at The Hague;[112] more than a year later he was in Delft again, but two of the court's officials continued to inquire into the Delft rector's behaviour.[113] He had been sentenced to conditional liberty within Delft, but in April 1525 he received permission to travel outside the city.[114] Later that year, however, in spite of being protected by some local dignitaries, Canirivus was again arrested and taken to The Hague. According to an eyewitness, his arrest provoked a street riot by his pupils.[115] This time his imprisonment lasted from 1–27 September 1525.[116] After this incident not a trace remains of him.

"Multa moliuntur aduersarii per mandata, epistolas, legationes etiam, sed infatuat Dominus consilia Ahitophel [2 Sam 15–17], et fit, vt monte parturiente nascatur ridiculus mus. Tantum scio si vel semel liceat in publico concionari, res monachorum (quae hic infestissimae sunt veritati) plane ad nihilum redituras, cum magna ex parte labefactatae sint paucilis in gymnasio nostro sermonibus a me habitis. Sed expectanda patienter voluntas ac beneplacitum Domini, qui cum videat vsque adeo fervere nos, consulto dissimulat auxilium ne nostris conatibus aut laboribus quidquam arrogemus si omnia simpliciter cadant, cum non tam habet rationem vocandorum vt ad gratiam perueniant, quam iam vocatorum vt in gratia permaneant, sed vbi viderit nos cessare, imo desperare salutem Israel, ac totis animis inde pendere, vt ipse solus operetur iam in medio terrae, tum demum ex improuiso aderit ecclesiae suae, qui insperata feret auxilia, vt tantum Deo sit laus et gloria, Amen. Erasmum indies magis frigescere et, quantum ego iudicare possum, retractare latenter quae videatur olim liberius vel dixisse vel scripsisse, aegerrime fero et agnosco puerilem metum qui plus veretur hominum gloriam quam Dei. Caeterum tales Nicodemi apud nos in magno sunt numero, sed qui firmius starent haud dubie si detur publicare gloriam Christo, quo uno fortificantur aegre conscientiae."

[110] Fredericq IV, p. 185.

[111] Fredericq IV, no. 151 (pp. 215–216).

[112] Fredericq IV, no. 166 (pp. 233–234).

[113] Fredericq IV, no. 236 (p. 292).

[114] Fredericq IV, no. 277 (pp. 336–337). A facsimile of the original text of this document can be found in Oosterbaan, 'School en kerk in het middeleeuwse Delft', p. 115.

[115] See A. Matthaeus, ed., *Fundationes et fata ecclesiarum* (Leiden, 1704), p. 522, and see Oosterbaan, 'Kerk en school in het middeleeuwse Delft', p. 120, note 126.

[116] Fredericq V, p. 10.

Ioannes Sartorius was known as an erudite linguist.[117] Born at Amsterdam in about 1500, he obtained his master of arts degree at the University of Louvain, before becoming rector of the Latin school in his place of birth some time before 1525. In the autumn of that year he was arrested as an adherent of Luther and held as a prisoner in the *Voorpoort* at The Hague. Canirivus, Gnapheus and three priests, among them Pistorius, were his fellow prisoners. At the end of September Sartorius was taken to Heusden, then via The Hague to 's-Hertogenbosch. In December he was sentenced in Amsterdam; Sartorius recanted. Some time later he was a schoolmaster at Noordwijk, from where he was summoned to The Hague in 1527. In 1531 he taught again in Amsterdam, where the conservative priest Cornelius Crocus attacked his seditious conviction that man is saved by faith alone. In 1534 Sartorius again incriminated himself by openly demonstrating his lack of respect for ecclesiastical institutions. Eventually he was banished from Amsterdam. Intermittently he stayed at Noordwijk, from where he visited several places, among them Basel; the printer Ioannes Oporinus published one of his works. Sartorius died in Delft in 1557. He wrote five books; a *Grammatica*, a *Syntaxis*, the *Exercitus* (Latin sayings against barbarisms), the *Adagia* with Dutch translations and *Paraphrases* of the Old Testament prophets, preceded by an *Isagoge*. While the *Exercitus* was printed only in 1540 and later, his *Adagia* as well as his *Paraphrases* were probably written in the late 1540s and early 1550s; they were published posthumously (in 1561 and 1558 respectively). The composition and edition dates of these works are too far remote from the early 1520s to reveal any information about Sartorius's religious views at that time; these views, moreover, towards the end of his life seem to have radicalized into weary spiritualism with apparent affinities to the thought of Sebastian Franck. But his *Grammatica*, although printed in 1533, must have been completed by 1527: the work was dedicated to Gnapheus, *gymnasiarcha Hagensis*, while in 1528 Gnapheus was head of a school at Geervliet. And his *Syntaxis*, published for the first time in 1530, was dedicated to the Alkmaar *gymnasiarch* Petrus Nannius in 1528. Both works reveal something about Sartorius's attitude and the way he wanted to convey his opinions to his pupils and readers: as pointed

[117] On Sartorius, see the exhaustive contribution by J. Trapman, 'Ioannes Sartorius (ca. 1500–1557), gymnasiarch te Amsterdam en Noordwijk, als erasmiaan en spiritualist', NAK 70 (1990) 30–51.

out in a recent study, Sartorius combined the teaching of grammar with piety. As an example of a male and female noun Sartorius gave "homo" and "bulla" respectively, a clear reference to Erasmus's adage *homo bulla*, "man is an air bubble". And when he wanted to demonstrate that words ending in the accusative on *-im* end in the ablative on *-i*, Sartorius cited an Erasmian sentence: "vim vi repellere prohibet Christus".[118] While schoolmasters had a good opportunity to propagate their views through the sermons they had to deliver on Sundays and holidays (not uncommonly these were public), Sartorius's example reveals another way in which pupils could be educated evangelically.

It finally remains to be considered whether members of this circle of dissidents can be held responsible for a Dutch translation of the New Testament, based on Erasmus's *Nouum Testamentum*, which appeared in Delft in 1524.[119] The rendering is preceded by a translation of Erasmus's *Praefatio* to his *Nouum Testamentum*, a foreword by the printer, Cornelis Heynricz. Lettersnijder, and by Pope Leo X's high praise of Erasmus's work. The printer sings Erasmus's praises: his appearance on the scene is due to God's gracious love in sending "the very learned and wise lover of truth, Germany's honour" to feed the hungry multitude. His praiseworthy translation of the New Testament is considered worthy of being rendered into Dutch, and the printer expounds which principles have guided the translator(s). Explanatory additions are placed in brackets, and as "St Jerome's translation", though obscure, is not reprehensible, its readings, when different from those of Erasmus, are given in the margin.[120] The translation was evidently done by the reform-minded: the word *ecclesia*, for instance, is repeatedly translated as 'congregation' and not as 'church', which seemed a tainted word. The only prologue this translation contains, a foreword to St Paul's Epistle to the Romans, reveals the translator(s) as sharing Luther's ideas about good

---

[118] See Trapman, 'Ioannes Sartorius', p. 39.

[119] NK 378: *Dat Niewe Testament welc is dat leuende woert Gods* … (Delft: Cornelis Heynricsz. Lettersnijder, 9 November 1524); see De Bruin-Broeyer, *De Statenbijbel en zijn voorgangers*, pp. 105–109, S.W. Bijl, *Erasmus in het Nederlands tot 1617*. Bibliotheca Bibliographica Neerlandica, 10 (Nieuwkoop, 1978), pp. 32–50, and A.A. den Hollander, *De Nederlandse Bijbelvertalingen, 1522–1545/Dutch translations of the Bible, 1522–1545*. Bibliotheca Bibliographica Neerlandica, 33 (Nieuwkoop, 1997), pp. 51–58, 218, 289–291.

[120] See Bijl, *Erasmus in het Nederlands tot 1617*, pp. 34–35, where the printer's foreword is copied.

works and justification by faith alone. The equation of knowledge of Christ with knowledge of Christ's benefactions hints at the influence of Melanchthon.[121]

What was the identity of the translator(s)? He/they evidently admired Erasmus and shared some of Luther's most central views. S.W. Bijl more or less denied that Hoen, Gnapheus, Hondebeke or Pistorius had a share in the translation. Hoen's view of the Eucharist, according to Bijl, is not reflected in the translation of ICor 11,23–24, while the biblical citations in Gnapheus's martyrologium of Pistorius and in his *Troost ende spiegel* are not identical to the translation in the Delft New Testament. While the first argument is not to the point (not the wording but the interpretation of this passage is under discussion), the second, by itself, is not convincing either, as biblical citations were generally made from memory. (Hoen knew Erasmus's translation and annotations, but his citations follow the Vulgate.)[122] These remarks, of course, do not establish that the translation was done by members of the Delft–The Hague circle, but while these counter-arguments can be dismissed, some arguments can be advanced in support of Hoen's and Gnapheus's participation. Firstly, Hoen evidently knew Erasmus's *Nouum Testamentum* and was favourably disposed towards Luther's ideas on salvation.[123] Secondly, he was known for his contacts with his namesake, the Delft printer (as one of Aurelius's letters revealed).[124] Thirdly, the apparent traces of Melanchthon's ideas hint at Gnapheus, who had read Melanchthon's works and elaborated his ideas in *Een troost ende spiegel*.[125] Although these arguments are not conclusive, they are sufficient to suggest that Hoen and Gnapheus helped to translate the Delft New Testament. In any case, they are the only individuals known from the circle of dissidents who match the characteristics of the possible translators. Only additional information from sources hitherto unknown may yield conclusive evidence.

---

[121] See Bijl, *Erasmus in het Nederlands tot 1617*, pp. 39–40, where this prologue is printed.
[122] See *infra* chapter III, 2.
[123] See *infra* chapter III, 2 and III, 4.
[124] See *supra*.
[125] See note 73 above.

5. *Trial*

The course of Hoen's trial can be reconstructed from a number of sources: the court registrar Aernout Sandelijn's *Derde Memoriaelboek*; Andries Jacobsz.' *Prothocolle*; the correspondence between the regent, Margaret of Austria, and her nephew Charles V, and notes in the records of the chamber of accounts and in the resolutions of the magistrates of the city of Haarlem. These sources cover the period from March to October 1523 and have been printed by Paul Fredericq in his inestimable *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis*.[126] Hoen, however, was already under prosecution from the early spring of 1522, as becomes clear from sources which have hitherto gone unnoticed: the report (*dingtalen*) of the lawsuit between Hoen's wife (Maritgen or Margriet Willemsdochter Hoogstraet) and councillor Floris Oem van Wyngaerden, and the court's *sententies*.[127]

By the early spring of 1522 Hoen had become a suspected person. In March he received sealed letters from the emperor, but as he paid no attention to them, he received several additional letters which summoned him to come to Brussels in person and respond to the information the emperor had been given, namely, that Hoen was among Luther's adherents in the county of Holland.[128] The same charge (*mandement*) ordered several of the court's bailiffs to make an inventory of Hoen's goods and to take possession of them. Claes van Dam, custodian of the procurator-general, appointed a woman by the name of Anna Aelbrechtsdochter to keep Hoen's house and household goods in the name of the emperor.[129] In spite of these measures Hoen was still unwilling to appear in Brussels. Meanwhile, Charles V appointed Hulst

---

[126] Fredericq IV, nos. 125–127 (pp. 178–182), 130 (p. 183; = Allen, ep. 1358. 26–31), 149 (p. 214), 151–153 (pp. 215–219), 157 (pp. 221–222), 161–164 (pp. 228–233), 166 (pp. 233–234), 170–172 (pp. 236–238), 236 (p. 292), 277 (pp. 336–337) and Fredericq V, nr. 640 (pp. 261–267, at p. 266). An extensive description of Hoen's trial based on these sources is found in De Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland*, pp. 176–199.

[127] The Hague, ARA, Archief Hof van Holland, Register van Acten, Dingtalen ende lopende Appoinctementen van Partijen, no. 2930 (under 15 September 1522), ff. 1recto–5recto and (under 30 September 1522), ff. 9verso–10verso (not continuously paginated); The Hague, ARA, Archief Hof van Holland, Sententies (civiel), no. 497, sentences 155 (22 December 1522) and 170 (13 January 1523).

[128] Dr. Heide Stratenwerth (University of Konstanz) kindly informed me that these letters, unfortunately, have not been preserved.

[129] Frans vander Hulst's elaborate financial account of his persecutions reveals that he did indeed pay a sum of money to Claes van Dam and a bailiff who in May 1522

inquisitor in April 1522.[130] He was commissioned to proceed against the "Lutherans" not only in Brabant, but also in the Netherlands, in Flanders and elsewhere. As imperial commissioner, Hulst issued a new *mandement* summoning Hoen to Dordrecht at the cost of banishment and confiscation of his possessions. Hoen ignored this summons too. Consequently, in June 1522 Hulst and the Dordrecht pensionary Floris Oem van Wyngaerden (councillor of the court) went to The Hague to gather further information. They decided to have a look at Hoen's house to check whether his household goods were being kept safe. When they knocked at the front gate, the female housekeeper opened a small window, but upon seeing the two men, she rapidly closed it again, keeping the gate shut. Oem shouted to her that an imperial commissioner stood at the door and wanted to come in. The woman, however, was unrelenting. Hulst sent a messenger to Claes van Dam and told him that, in the name of the emperor, Hoen's house had been placed in his hands. Van Dam, impressed, ordered the gate to be opened and Hulst and Oem entered the house; they did not see Hoen's wife. According to Hoen's supporters, however, both men had violently forced their way into the house. This happened at night, between 7 and 8 pm; following the woman's refusal to open the gate, Oem had forced it 'by the power of his body', and had threatened to smash the windows as well. He had ordered several men to climb the walls of Hoen's house; at this Anna Aelbrechtsdochter became terrified and fled. When relatives hurried over to help her and Hoen's wife, Oem and his retinue ranted and raved so much as to cause Willem Sonderdanck's wife to have a spontaneous abortion. This violent behaviour led Hoen and his wife to lodge a complaint against Oem for inflicting unlawful damage (*actio damnum iniuriam datum*).

In the ensuing trial the defendants—Oem and Hulst, through their solicitor—repeatedly urged that a case like Hoen's fell under the remit given to Hulst by Charles V, and that for this reason only the commissioner or the emperor's privy council were empowered to hear the

---

spent thirteen days (!) in making a list of Hoen's possessions and to the woman who cared for them for a period of six weeks: Fredericq V, p. 266.

[130] The documents for Charles's appointment of Hulst are in *Recueil des ordonnances des Pays-Bas* II/2 (1520–1529), J. Lameere, ed. (Brussels, 1898), pp. 171–173, 188–191 (see also Fredericq IV, nos. 72–73 [pp. 101–105], 79–80 [pp. 115–120] and 86 [pp. 123–127]). Frans vander Hulst (who died in December 1530) had studied law at Louvain and from 1505 had been a member of the Council of Brabant in Brussels; he was a well-known opponent of the new learning as well as of the Lutherans.

case. In their view Hoen's case should be referred to the court of jurisdiction (the commissioner or the privy council).[131] In his reply Hoen and his wife—through their solicitor, Adriaen van Dam—replied that Oem had discredited Hoen at the imperial court in Brussels, that Hoen had indeed received letters from his Majesty, but had rejected these *mandements* as they were not in accordance with "common law and the privileges of Holland", having been issued in Brabant (that is, outside the borders of Holland).

At this point Hoen referred to privileges which in March 1523 the States of Holland would describe as "several great privileges which they had long ago received from the counts of Holland, the predecessors of the emperor". One of these privileges was "that all subjects and inhabitants of the county of Holland, regardless of the case, would be treated according to the law and privileges which they enjoyed. Even in cases of heresy every Hollander was therefore judged by the regent, the president and members of the council established in Holland".[132] This formulation of the *ius de non euocando* referred to privileges originally given to several cities and ultimately on 11 June 1452 by Philip of Burgundy to the entire county. The Great Privilege of 1477 and the letter of privilege (*voorrechtbrief*) issued by Maximilian on 26 May 1486 confirmed the autonomy of the towns. The privilege *de non euocando* implied that Hollanders were exempted from trial outside the borders of their county. Some exceptions, however, were made, one of them being treason (*lèse majesté*). In his edict of 1521 the emperor expressed the opinion (dating from the thirteenth century when episcopal courts of inquisition for the prosecution of heresy were established) that heresy was also a case of treason, *viz*. treason against God (*lèse majesté divine*; *laesa majestatis diuinae*), and that for this reason the appeal to the privilege *de non euocando* and ordinary legal procedure was invalid in such cases. Plainly, provincial representatives did not agree with this interpretation, stating that the treatment of heresy should not differ from normal legal procedure.[133]

It is, therefore, clear why Hoen was unwilling to leave Holland and stand trial in Brussels. Out of obedience, Hoen—so his reply continued—had eventually sent his *excusatie ende exceptie* (defence and

---

[131] On the term 'renvoy' which is used here, see Wedekind, *Bijdrage tot de kennis van de ontwikkeling van de procesgang in civiele zaken voor het Hof van Holland in de eerste helft van de zestiende eeuw*, p. 85.

[132] Fredericq IV, p. 179.

[133] See the discussion in G. Grosheide, *Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis der Anabaptisten in Amsterdam* (Hilversum, 1938), pp. 272–287.

plea) to satisfy the emperor. Hoen, however, had been slandered before the emperor to such an extent that nobody dared to take up his defence—when during a meeting of the States of Holland Arndt van der Gout, the president of the chamber of accounts, had spoken in Hoen's defence, Oem had reported this to the emperor's confessor.

After this incident, the emperor had commissioned Harman Harmansz., a bailiff, to list Hoen's possessions and to summon him before his Majesty's privy council. Harmansz. entrusted Hoen's possessions to the care of Willem Sonderdanck, but failed to actually execute the *mandement* or *citatie* (summons). Hulst thereupon issued a new summons on 15 June 1522, to which, however, his own seal and not that of the Court of Holland was attached. Nevertheless, that very same day Oem violently forced his way into Hoen's house and deprived him of his possessions—for which action he apparently had no legal commission. In response to this legally incorrect citation Hoen appealed to the emperor, and repeated that he was willing to stand trial only before the Grand Council of Mechelen or the Court of Holland. Hoen added that he would assent to a further exposition of his actions if protection of his life was guaranteed. But he distrusted Hulst on account of his violent actions and suggested (without giving any further details) that the only cause of Hulst's aggressive behaviour was hate and anger occasioned by rancour. In Hoen's view it was clear that Hulst was an inappropriate judge. Finally, Hoen's demand was a case of *actio damnum iniuriam datum* and thus was not a Lutheran case ("nyet en concerneert die saicke van den lutherianen").

In his response (*dupliek*) of 30 September 1522, Oem pressed his earlier arguments: Hoen's case should fall under the jurisdiction of Hulst's imperial commission to proceed against the "Lutherans", for Hoen proved to be not completely uncontaminated by the case of the Lutherans ("heel ende al onbesmet […] vanden saicke vanden lutherianen"). For this reason he asked for a *renvoy* of Hoen's case to the proper and qualified court, that is, the emperor's council or Hulst.

The Court of Holland pronounced sentence in December 1522 and January 1523. It stated: *quod curia non defert*, that is, giving in to Oem's insistence, it declared itself incompetent, and referred the case to the authorized judges. After the court thus surrendered its privileges, the overzealous Hulst seized the opportunity to take drastic measures against Hoen. He had Hoen arrested "as if he were a thief or murderer" and had him transported, not particularly gently, to the city of Geertruidenberg on the border of Holland and Brabant. He was

imprisoned in a dungeon for criminals. The States of Holland were upset. The procedure provoked their anger and indignation and they interpreted Hulst's action as contrary to their privileges. They urged Margaret of Austria to use her authority to set Hoen free and to let him return to his own house in The Hague. If, they argued—in contrast to the court's earlier pronouncement—Hoen might indeed have been contaminated by the Lutheran sect, his case according to the county's privilege should be heard by the court at The Hague. Margaret knew Hoen to be "a learned man, who was devout, a great alms-giver, of unblemished conduct and speech, an advocate before the Court of Holland and otherwise of good reputation", and sought the advice of the "presidents and members of both the privy and financial councils as well as of the Grand Council of Malines" ("chiefs-présidens et gens du priué et grand Conseil de l'empereur et des finances"). They advised the regent to grant the States their request. On 3 March 1523 she ordered that Hoen be brought back to The Hague under safe conduct. He was to be detained there and his case was to be reopened by Hulst and a councillor of the Court of Holland appointed by the *stadholder*, the Count of Hoochstraten. Hulst was instructed to produce all the information he had gathered and to add, if necessary, new facts and evidence from witnesses. Two doctors of theology would then interrogate Hoen before all the documents were brought before Joost Lauwerijns, president of the Grand Council of Malines.[134] The procedure laid down in this instruction was to apply not only to Hoen's case but to all future cases of heresy.[135] Some days later Margaret acquainted Emperor Charles with what had taken place. In defiance of his instructions, she wrote, Hulst had taken Hoen outside the borders of Holland and at the request of the States and on the advice of the emperor's councils she had had Hoen brought back to The Hague.[136] In his *Prothocolle*, the Amsterdam town secretary also recorded the course of events. Hoen had been imprisoned *propter sectam Lutheranam*, but the regent had been

[134] On Lauwerijns, see Allen, ep. 1299; in 1515 he entered the Grand Council and in 1522 became its president. After he had been added to the commission for the extirpation of heresy in May 1522, Erasmus wrote him a letter to warn him against conservative theologians such as Nicolaas Baechem and Jacob of Hoochstraten (ep. 1299). Lauwerijns, however, sided with these theologians and subsequently Erasmus depicted him as a bitter enemy of the new learning (Allen, ep. 1717.16–18 and ep. 1747.28–30). A similar unfavourable view of Lauwerijns is given in Gnapheus's description of Pistorius's trial.

[135] Fredericq IV, no. 125 (pp. 179–181).

[136] Fredericq IV, no. 126 (p. 181).

forced to accept a new legal procedure against heresy. The commotion these events occasioned also becomes abundantly clear from the indignant statements about Hoen's sufferings and the apparent malicious pleasure over Hulst's fall in Erasmus's correspondence.[137]

During the following months Hoen's case apparently came to a standstill. Not until July 1523 is there evidence of new proceedings. In that month Holland's most important cities—Haarlem, Amsterdam, Delft and Gouda—gave a petition to the regent asking her not to delay the continuation of his trial.[138] At the same time, however, Hulst made fresh attempts to remove Hoen from the province of Holland. At the end of July or the beginning of August 1523, Hulst, together with Margaret, sent letters to the Court of Holland and to the magistrates of Delft to have Hoen and Canirivus transported to Gorinchem. There Hulst wanted to examine them further with the aid of several doctors of theology, and to settle their case. At a meeting in The Hague the cities of Holland resisted these plans as contrary to the privileges of the county and of each individual town. Moreover, they feared that such a trial would cause much unrest among the county's population. Although the representatives of Haarlem, Gouda and Delft were inclined to offer resistance, those of Dordrecht, incited by their pensionary Oem, declared themselves unwilling to support this opposition, while the Leiden delegates made it known that they had received no charge on this question. Subsequently it was decided that the delegates would assemble again on 14 August to make a decision on the case. In the intervening period, however, Oem again resorted to brute force. One night, assisted by a band of officers of the court, he attempted to remove Hoen and Gnapheus from the *Voorpoort* and transport them by cart to Gorinchem. However, he was prevented from doing so, for Hoen and Gnapheus sounded the alarm and the guard refused Oem permission to enter. This unrestrained action again loosed a storm of protest in the States. The Court of Holland only now came out in support of the policy of the States.[139]

---

[137] Allen, epp. 1358 and 1394; see *supra*.

[138] Fredericq IV, no. 149 (p. 214).

[139] Fredericq IV, no. 152 (pp. 216–217), at p. 217: "Binnen den ixen Augusti ende den xiiijen Augusti heeft Mr Floris Oom gepoocht Mr Cornelis Hoen ende Mr Wilhelmus Voldersgraft mit een wagen snaechs uuyte Haghe vande Voorpoort te brengen tot Gorcum, *sed impeditum propter appellationem per illos duos interpositam et consilio et commissario insinuatam*. De Raedt te rade genomen zynde omme de acte den state vanden landen geconsenteert voor te staen, seyden dat dacte byde staten geimpetreert was, zy wisten

During the meeting of 14 August Oem still maintained that all cases of heresy fell directly under the jurisdiction of the pope and the emperor and that Dordrecht for that very reason was not willing to support the opposition of the other cities. Nevertheless the other four cities decided to resist and Albert van Loo, the advocate of the common land,[140] who was empowered to speak on behalf of the States in discussions with agents of the central government, declared that the procedure against Hoen was *contra bonos mores, contra antiquam consuetudinem, contra ius commune, contra actum impetratum auditis partibus, et quod commissarius residentiam facit a Gorcum vbi non est tutus accessus nec copia doctorum, et quod in Haga est flos justicie.*[141]

Hulst's defence was to refer to the general commission which he had received in the meantime from Pope Adrian VI, who on 1 June 1523 had promoted Hulst to *vniuersalis et generalis inquisitor et investigator cum plena ac omnimoda potestate et auctoritate* in the Low Countries.[142] Hulst now argued that he was responsible to the pope alone. But on 23 August 1523 Hulst and Oem were severely criticized by the nobles and representatives of the smaller cities of Holland.[143] From his papal commission, Hulst deduced that he was no longer bound to his imperial commission which stated that he was not allowed to proceed against offences before Charles's publication of placards; in Hulst's opinion, all offences since Pope Leo X's excommunication of Luther fell under his jurisdiction. At this point, the Delft pensionary Hugo van Eynde declared that in his opinion Hulst was not an appropriate inquisitor for four reasons: he was a layman; a bigamist; a homicide, and an enemy of the country. One of the reasons for this accusation was Hulst's boast that he would treat Hoen in such a manner that all Italy, Spain, England and France would applaud him. But an official protest addressed to the regent resulted in Margaret's admission that Hulst's inference was incorrect: he was allowed only to proceed against cases that had occurred after July 1522.[144] In September Hulst's behaviour led to him being suspended by Margaret. She had ordered him to stay in The

---

hoe zy voorstaen soude tgunt by hen geimpetreert was, hen stoet te obedieren." The fact of the court's alteration seems a significant addition to Tracy's exposé in his *Holland under Habsburg Rule*; see *infra*, note 151.

140 Fredericq IV, p. 235.

141 Fredericq IV, nos. 151–153 (pp. 215–219); citation at p. 218.

142 Fredericq IV, nos. 136–137 (pp. 186–191).

143 See Fredericq IV, no. 157 (pp. 221–222).

144 Fredericq IV, no. 161.

Hague and to proceed against heretics there because the best lawyers and many learned men (*flos iusticiae* and *copia doctorum*) were in The Hague, but Hulst—fearing he might be killed the moment he entered that city—instead stayed in Gorcum. After a second refusal to obey Margaret's order he had gone to Brussels to justify his actions before the Grand Council. In a letter to Charles of 6 September, Margaret suggested the pope look for a new inquisitor.[145] The next day representatives of the States of Holland visited Margaret. On that occasion she responded that the only thing she could do was to write to Pope Adrian, as Hulst had appealed to his papal commission which was beyond her jurisdiction.[146] Some days later, on 10 September, during a meeting of the larger cities of Holland, Dordrecht was asked to dismiss Oem for his trespasses against the rules of secrecy and it was made known that Margaret had asked Pope Adrian to deprive Hulst of his commission. Margaret was also advised to appoint in his place a moderate and reputable 'personnaige ecclésiastique', to be assisted by three or four like-minded officials. At this, Hulst, in a final and desperate attempt not to lose face, denounced Margaret's act of 3 March 1523, which had been signed by the *audienceur* Laurens Dublioul,[147] as a forgery, but on 9 October Dublioul publicly proved before a meeting of the States of Holland that the act was authentic and legitimate.

After Hulst's dismissal—he was succeeded on 17 June 1524 by Nicolas Coppin[148]—Hoen's case was finally settled; he was sentenced to conditional liberty within The Hague. In October 1523, Hoen and Gnapheus were sent for by the *stadholder*, the Lord of Assendelft, to give over their bail and to accept The Hague as their prison and not to leave it, on forfeit of a sum of money.[149] The act which released them on bail (dated 29 October 1523) mentions Hoen's brother-in-law Willem Sonderdanck and a certain Jan Splinter, both of them citizens of The Hague, as the people who stood bail for Hoen and Gnapheus for the sum of 3,000 ducats, which they would have to pay to the emperor in the event that Hoen and/or Gnapheus ever left The Hague. Hoen added a promise not to do so except with the emperor's, Margaret's or the court's consent and agreed to compensate his sureties by mortgaging all his pos-

145 Fredericq IV, no. 162.
146 Fredericq IV, no. 164, nos. 166–170.
147 Fredericq IV, no. 125 (pp. 178–181).
148 Fredericq IV, nos. 219–220.
149 Fredericq IV, no. 171.

sessions. Simultaneously, Canirivus was sentenced to conditional liberty within Delft.[150]

The course of Hoen's trial and the discussions it roused clearly show that his case has rightly been regarded as a *cause célèbre*. Its importance is well summarized by James D. Tracy in his study *Holland under Habsburg Rule*: "By inducing the Regent to remove Hulst, the States had won an important victory since Charles V would not again attempt to create a tribunal specifically for the purpose of prosecution for heresy. Instead, this task devolved to the secular courts at the provincial level and to the ecclesiastical courts. […] The real struggle was between the Council of Holland in The Hague and town governments determined to shield their burghers from unlawful prosecution." This incident made it clear to those involved that Holland was "an articulated polity, in which […] privileges like *de non evocando* could have meaning at different levels". The appeals to privileges were one of the unifying forces which took the province traverse a considerable way from the fractiousness of a territory ruled by a prince to the self-ordered fractiousness of a republic.[151]

After his condemnation, Hoen disappears. Aurelius, as we have seen, addressed some writings and letters to him and asked him to have them published. Gnapheus, in the prologue to his *Mirror and Consolation of the Sick*, wrote that his and Hoen's imprisonment lasted for two years.[152] His own imprisonment, which like Hoen's began in October 1523, must have ended in April 1525, for shortly after his release he was arrested again, in May 1525. Gnapheus added that Hoen died during this period. Moreover, when the bails for Gnapheus and Canirivus were renewed on 23 April 1525,[153] Hoen was no longer mentioned. Being an old man, it is likely that he died in the winter of 1524/1525.[154]

---

[150] Fredericq IV, no. 172 (pp. 237–238).

[151] James D. Tracy, *Holland under Habsburg Rule, 1506–1566*, pp. 155, 174–175, 216–217.

[152] Gnapheus, *Tobias ende Lazarus […]*, A5verso–A6recto.

[153] Fredericq IV, no. 277 (pp. 336–337).

[154] Hoen's widow outlived him for at least nine years. In February 1529 she was fined 200 carolus guilders; the same year she sold her estate in Eykenduynen. In 1534 she was again charged, this time by the Court of Holland, to pay 300 carolus guilders to the widow of her late son, Willem Cornelisz. van Dyck (did Hoen's son change his name because of his father's disrepute?). See De Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland*, pp. 547–548; *supra*, note 180; J.Th. de Smidt and J. van Rompaey, edd., *Chronologische lijsten van de geëxtendeerde sententiën berustende in het archief van de Grote Raad van Mechelen* III: *1531–1541* (Brussels, 1979), p. 133.

None of the sources discussed above mentions the specific reason for Hoen's trial. It is only stated that he was arrested *propter sectam lutheranam* or that he was not "heel ende al onbesmet vanden saicke vanden lutherianen", but as similar formulae, as is well-known, were conventional in denoting heresy, they do not provide any particulars about the actual nature of a person's convictions. Aurelius's letters admonished Hoen to moderation and thus reveal that his convictions, whatever else they may have been, were definitely radical. It may be that they were more or less determined by the mysterious *vetus scriptum* found by Hoen and some of his friends among the papers left by Jacob Hoeck, the dean of Naaldwijk.[155] For a more detailed assessment of Hoen's religious ideas and their sources, we should therefore turn our attention to the treatise with which his name has been closely connected and which was printed in 1525 under the title of *Epistola christiana admodum*.

[155] See Hardenberg's *Vita Wesseli Groningensis*, in Wessel Gansfort, *Opera*, **–***2verso, at **6verso–**7verso, elaborately summarized and discussed *supra*. On Jacobus Hoeck, see M. van Rhijn, 'Jacobus Hoeck', in M. van Rhijn, *Studien over Wessel Gansfort en zijn tijd* (Utrecht, 1933), pp. 112–126; after an extensive description of Hoeck's career and his actions against the allegedly heretical opinions of Wessel Gansfort (which Hoeck successfully urged Anthonius de Castro to refute), Van Rhijn concludes that Hoeck's was the conservative standpoint and that for this reason it is in spite of himself that his name plays a role in Reformation history. Additional (but no revisionist) information on Hoeck can be found in H. de Vocht, *Monumenta Humanistica Lovaniensia*, pp. 291–292 and H. de Vocht, *History of the Foundation and Rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense, 1517–1550* I (Louvain, 1951), p. 143 (note 4).

CHAPTER THREE

THE *EPISTOLA CHRISTIANA ADMODUM*: CONTENTS, SOURCES AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

This chapter first presents an extensive summary of the contents of Hoen's epistle on the Eucharist. A detailed discussion of all the arguments it proposes seems necessary, as virtually only one argument—the interpretation of *hoc est corpus meum* as *hoc significat corpus meum*—is generally known. The ensuing sections of this chapter are devoted to an investigation of Hoen's sources. The letter provides three clues to its sources and these hints therefore need to be discussed first: Erasmus and Thomas Aquinas, and the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX (sections III.2 and III.3). Additionally, an old historiographical tradition holds that Wessel's writings form the historical background to some of Hoen's convictions. This alleged relationship is discussed in section III.4. The text, moreover, contains a hidden reference to a treatise by Luther, who appears to have inspired Hoen in some other points as well. Hoen's indebtedness to his revolutionary contemporary is examined in section III.5.

In the course of this discussion, however, it will become evident that the roots of Hoen's most characteristic arguments have to be looked for elsewhere. They reach back to medieval traditions of dissent which became focused in the thought of heretics such as Wyclif and Hus. The concluding parts of this chapter are devoted to a discussion of these forerunners and seek to answer the question of how these sources may have reached Hoen (III.6).

1. *Contents*

Hoen's *Epistola Christiana admodum* expounds a series of arguments against the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. Its tone is intellectual and rational; part of the argument consists of scholastic reasoning *ad absurdum* to demonstrate that some complicated questions on the Eucharist cannot be solved within the traditional theological frame-

work.[1] But the writing is rather rambling and diffuse in that it does not show any consistent principle of development in the series of questions and objections raised.

The text as it has come down to us begins with a statement about the correct interpretation of the Eucharist, based on a judicial figure of speech; two more such figures of speech are presented in the course of the exposition. In the answer to the question of what it means to eat Christ and to drink his blood, Hoen argues that Christ instituted the sacrament in order to give those who are his own a sure pledge (*pignus*) for the forgiveness of their sins. Christ had often promised forgiveness to his disciples and wished to strengthen their souls at the Last Supper by adding a pledge to his promise lest there be any uncertainty on their part. A bridegroom (*sponsus*) gives a ring to his bride, saying: 'Take this, I give myself to you', so that the bride knows the bridegroom to be hers and turns her heart from all other suitors to concentrate on her husband (*maritus*); similarly, he who receives the sacrament of the Eucharist (the pledge of Christ) steadfastly believes Christ to be his, given for him, and his blood shed for him, wherefore he will turn his heart away from all he used to love and will cling to Christ alone. This, according to the gospel of John 6, is truly eating Christ's flesh and drinking his blood.[2] Further on in his *Epistola* Hoen uses other legal images: just as a man selling some land gives the buyer a staff, straw or a stone and says, 'By this token I give you the land', and just as the ownership of a house is transferred by handing over the keys, so the Lord gave himself to us by means of the bread (*sic etiam Dominus per panem se ipsum tradit nobis*).[3]

In contemporary law the latter two transactions were referred to as *traditio symbolica*, which means the acquisition of the right of possession without the actual surrender of property.[4] Hoen's use of these figures means that in his opinion Christ transferred himself by the token of the bread, without this token being or becoming Christ himself corporeally. The bread of the Eucharist is thus regarded as an effective sign of Christ's grace. Similarly, the ring which the bridegroom (Christ) gives clearly does not literally change into him. The act Hoen describes and

[1] Appendix 1 (below, pp. 226–235), Ep. 230.11 – 231.26 (all future references are to the edition of the Latin text as presented in appendix 1).

[2] Ep. 226.11 – 227.8.

[3] Ep. 232.17–21.

[4] See Hans Planitz and Thea Buyken, *Bibliographie zur deutschen Rechtsgeschichte* I (Frankfurt, 1952), pp. 286–287.

the formula he presents are those of the judicial practice of his day.[5] Marriage was regarded as a mutual gift: the bridegroom gave himself to his bride and the bride gave herself to her bridegroom. This act of exchange—sealed by the ring as the token of alliance—was the central rite of the wedding ceremony; the bilateral *datio corporum* (giving of bodies) was the act constitutive of marriage. This act was accompanied by words of mutual troth-plighting, which was considered by theologians the essence of the sacrament. The formula most commonly used was something like "I take you as my wife" (or husband), but a formula like "Moi je donne à toi mon corps en époux et mari" (or, "Moi je donne à toi mon corps en épouse") was also used,[6] which is closely similar to Hoen's formula *do me ipsum tibi*. It was normally after these or similar words had been spoken that the ring was given, to which gift the words *de isto annulo te sponso* were generally added. Notably, however, in the regions of the southern Low Countries it was only the groom who gave a ring to his bride.[7]

Hoen's use of the symbol of the ring in connection with the Eucharist is not unusual; the image of the ring was a traditional Christian symbol. The bridegroom's custom of giving a ring to his bride dates from Roman Antiquity; the ring (*annulus sponsalitius*) was regarded as a pledge, added to the promise (*sponsio*) to enforce it.[8] The pronunciation of a promise and the giving of a ring was therefore more than merely symbolic.[9] Both were regarded as the solemnization of marriage itself, not as a sign or foretaste of it. This corresponds to the passage referred to in Hoen's *Epistola*, when he speaks initially of a *sponsus* but later, after the *sponsus* has given a ring to his *sponsa*, calls him *maritus*.[10] The ancient ring symbolism was adopted by Christian theology. For Tertullian the

---

[5] See Jean-Baptiste Molin and Protais Mutembe, *Le rituel du mariage en France du XIIe au XVIe siècle*. Théologie historique, 26 (Paris, 1974), pp. 77–133. See also the article by the famous novelist J.J. Voskuil, 'Van onderpand tot teken. De geschiedenis van de trouwring als voorbeeld van functieverschuiving'. *Volkskundig Bulletin*, I, 2 (December 1975), pp. 44–79.

[6] Molin and Mutembe, *Le rituel du mariage en France*, p. 107.

[7] Molin and Mutembe, *Le rituel du mariage en France*, pp. 141–142, Voskuil, 'Van onderpand tot teken', pp. 54–56.

[8] Emile Chénon, 'Recherches historiques sur quelques rites nuptiaux', *Nouvelle revue historique de droit français et étranger* 36 (1912) 573–660, at pp. 574–587.

[9] Chénon, 'Recherches historiques sur quelques rites nuptiaux', p. 607, note 2. See also James A. Brundage, *Law, Sex and Christian Society in Medieval Europe* (Chicago–London, 1987), pp. 352, 412 (note 463) and 502; Christiane Klapisch-Zuber, *Women, Family and Ritual in Renaissance Italy* (Chicago–London, 1985), pp. 196–197.

[10] Ep. 226.13–17.

ring was a symbol of baptism.[11] In other places the image of the ring is used as a symbol of the mystical marriage between God and the faithful soul, while in the Middle Ages the bishop's ring symbolized the bond between him and the church.[12] Neither was the use of this symbol in connection with the Eucharist unprecedented. Bernard of Clairvaux (1090–1153), for instance, in a sermon on the Eucharist expounded that a sacrament is a sacred sign referring to something else, that is, a visible sign of God's invisible grace, and as such is comparable to a ring which is given to invest somebody with a certain heritage.[13] That Bernard's sermon was well-known in the sixteenth century is apparent from its citation in works by theologians such as Philip of Marnix and Albert Hardenberg.[14] A manuscript Latin sermon for Corpus Christi (England, ca. 1400)[15] contains a parable about a lord who, before going on

[11] *De pudicitia* (CSEL 20), 9. See also Gösta Claesson, *Index Tertullianeus* (Paris, 1974), p. 116. It is suggestive, but too speculative a supposition, that Hoen, as George H. Williams, *The Radical Reformation*. Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, 15 (Kirksville, 1992), pp. 107–108, writes, "may well have been influenced at this point by the lawyer-theologian of ancient North Africa".

[12] See Albert Blaise, *Le vocabulaire latin des principaux thèmes liturgiques* (Turnhout, s.a.), pp. 515, 521; George Ferguson, *Signs and Symbols in Christian Art* (London, 1972), pp. 111–112, 159, 178–179; Derk Visser, 'Neither Humanist nor Protestant: Ring, Betrothal, and Marriage in Literary and Artistic Discourse as Metaphors of Salvation by Grace', in Hans R. Guggisberg and Gottfried G. Krodel, edd., *Die Reformation in Deutschland und Europa: Interpretationen und Debatten* (Gütersloh, 1993), pp. 118–135.

[13] Bernardus of Clairvaux, 'Sermo prima in coena Domini', in *Opera* V = *Sermones* II, J. Leclercq and H. Rochais, edd. (Rome, 1968), p. 68: "Sacramentum dicitur sacrum signum sive sacrum secretum; multa siquidem fiunt propter se tantum, alia vero propter alia designanda, et ipsa dicuntur signa et sunt. Vt enim de vsualibus sumamus exemplum, datur anulus ad investiendum de hereditate aliqua et signum est, ita vt iam dicere possit qui accipit: anulus non valet quidquam, sed hereditas est quam quaerebam. In hunc itaque modum appropinquans passioni Dominus, de gratia sua investire curauit suos, vt inuisibilis gratia signo aliquo visibili praestaretur. Ad hoc instituta sunt omnia sacramenta, ad hoc eucharistiae participatio, ad hoc pedum ablutio, ad hoc denique ipse baptismus."

[14] Philip of Marnix, *Oeuvres*, Edgar Quinet, ed., 6 vols. (Brussels, 1857–1860), III, pp. 99–100. In his *Summa doctrinae de coena Domini* (1 December 1556) Albert Hardenberg cited the passage in question from a sermon by Wolfgang Musculus on Mt 26, which sermon was printed in Johan Timann's (Hardenberg's chief opponent) *Farrago*; see Daniel Gerdes, *Historia motuum ecclesiasticorum in ciuitate Bremensi sub medium seculi XVI. ab A. 1547–1561, tempore Alberti Hardenbergii suscitatorum* (Groningen–Bremen, 1756), pp. 100–107, at pp. 105–106, and Janse, *Albert Hardenberg als Theologe: Profil eines Bucerschülers*, pp. 181–185.

[15] Cambridge University Library, Ii.3.8, fols. 90recto–91verso; the sermon is discussed in Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge, 1991), pp. 226–229; Ms Rubin kindly supplied me with xeroxes of her transcription of this "sermon of especial originality and beauty" as she rightly calls it (p. 226).

a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, gave jewels to his friends and a golden ring to his wife by which they were to remember him. The *moralitas* of the story is that Christ, before going to heaven, had similarly left a ring, a golden ring which is his body, and in its roundness reminds the Christian of the ring which at Easter he receives in the form of bread.[16] Wessel Gansfort (ca. 1420–1489) similarly used the ring as a symbol of the Eucharist and described it as a pledge of divine love.[17]

These examples show that the use of this symbol in connection with the mystery of the Eucharist cannot be regarded as heterodox. This is revealed by three statements from the sixteenth century: by the Strasbourg reformer Martin Bucer, by Johannes Brenz and by Thomas More. In a sermon from 1523, at a time when he still adhered to the belief that the bread of the Eucharist really was the body of Christ, Bucer wrote that Christ gave his own body 'under dem brot' to the faithful as a pledge or sign, and thus gave them much more than if he had merely given them a ring, a seal or a letter.[18] In his *Syngramma Suevicum* (1526) the Lutheran preacher Johannes Brenz challenged Johannes Oecolampadius's spiritual interpretation of the Eucharist in the latter's *De genuina verborum Domini expositione liber* (1525); he agreed with Oecolampadius's examples of the key (which symbolizes the possession of a house) and the sceptre (which symbolizes the power to rule and to judge) as a foundation for his tropical interpretation of the words *Hoc est corpus meum*, but Brenz added that as soon as the words *do tibi potestatem* or *adcipe potestatem* are joined to the handing over of the key or sceptre, the key and sceptre become more than merely signs of *potestas* but are transformed into the *potestas* itself. Likewise, when Christ gave the bread of the Eucharist and spoke the words *Accipe, hoc est corpus meum*, the bread actually became his body.[19] Similarly, in his refutation

[16] Cambridge University Library, Ii.3.8., fol. 9orecto: "[Christus] dedit anulum suum aureum quod non est nisi corpus Christi, quod in rotunditate sic in visu hominis habet similitudinem anuli quem tu recepisti, Christiane, die pasche in forma panis."

[17] For a discussion of Wessel's ideas, see *infra*, chapter III, 4.

[18] *Martin Butzers an ein christlichen Rath und Gemeyn der statt Weissenburg Summary seiner Predig daselbst gethon*, MBDS I, pp. 69–147, at p. 118.15–18.

[19] See Johannes Brenz, *Syngramma Suevicum*, in Brenz, *Frühschriften* I, Martin Brecht, Gerhard Schäfer and Frieda Wolf, edd. (Tübingen, 1970), pp. 222–278, at p. 264.22–32. On the background of Brenz's use of the image of the sceptre, see Karl von Amira, 'Der Stab in der germanischen Rechtssymbolik', *Abhandlungen der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse* 25 (1909) 1–180. For Oecolampadius, see his *De genuina verborum Domini expositione liber* (Strasbourg, 1525), C1recto. As indicated by the editors of the modern edition of Brenz's works, Brenz had

of John Frith's 'erronyous wrytyng agaynst the blessed sacrament of the aultare' (1532), Thomas More acknowledged that a certain use of the symbol of the ring was compatible with traditional doctrine. Frith, however, had written that Christ had left the sacrament merely as a token and memorial, just like a husband who, before his departure for some faraway country, gave a ring to his wife as a memorial of him and a pledge of his faith.[20] More replied that he allowed the example of the bridegroom's ring but, contrary to Frith, he held that it was not the bread but Christ's "owne blessed body" that was the "whole substaunce of the same token and memoreall".[21] Frith's interpretation of

---

used a comparable image in connection with the forgiveness of sins: when a Christian speaks to his fellow Christian the words 'Ich verzeih dir die sund', then the latter's sins are forgiven because the words spoken are God's words, "gleich als ain ambtman auss bevelch seines herrn gepeut vnd verpeut, und so man hort den ambtman gebieten, ist man im gehorsam, nicht umb des ambtmans willen, sonder von wegen des herren gebots"; Brenz, *Underrichtung der zwispaltigen artickel cristenlichs glaubens* (1524–1526), in Brenz, *Frühschriften*, pp. 55–111, at p. 75.10–13.

[20] John Frith, *A christen sentence and true iudgement of the most honorable sacrament of Christes body and bloude declared both by the auctorite of the holy Scriptures and the ancient Doctores*, in Thomas More, *The Complete Works* VII (New Haven–London, 1990), pp. (423)427–433, at p. 431.38–432.13: "If a brydegrome whiche had promysed fayth and trouth to his bryde shulde depart into a farre countree for necessary busynes that he hath then to comfort his brydes harte he wolde saye on this maner. I must departe into a farre countree for vrgent maters. Neuerthelesse I shal leaue you such a token that ye shall be as sure of me, as though I were here present with you. Take this rynge and put it on youre fynger for it is my fayth and my trouth whiche I haue promised to kepe with you And therfore kepe it in remembraunce of me. And as surely as you haue this rynge on youre fynger, so sure may you be of me that I shall not dyceyue you. So that yf ye shulde any thyng mystrust me, then beholde the ryng which is my fayth and trouth, and it shall certyfye euen your outwarde senses that I am youres. And moche more is this trew in the Sacrament, for a man may repent hym of his promes, and dyceyue his bryde, but Christe can not repent hym of his gracious fauour, wher with he loueth vs, he can be no lyar, nether can deceyue vs. And therfore we nede not to doubt of his promes."

[21] *A letter of syr Tho. More knyght impugnynge the erronyouse wrytyng of Iohan Fryth agaynst the blessed sacrament of the aultare*, in Thomas More, *The Complete Works* VII, pp. (229)231–258, at p. 237.9–25: "Now his [sc. Frith's] ensample of hys brydegromys ryng, I very well allow. For I take the blessed sacrament to be lefte wyth vs for a very token and a memoryall, of Cryst in dede. But I saye that whole substaunce of the same token and memoreall, is hys owne blessed body, where as thys man wolde make it onely brede. And so I say that Cryst hath left vs a better token than this man wolde haue vs take it fore, and therin fareth lyke a man to whom a brydegrome had delyuered a goodly gold rynge with a ryche ruby therin, to deliuer ouer to his bryde for a token, and than he wold lyke a false shrew, kepe away that gold rynge, and gyue the bryde in the stede therof a proper rynge of a rysshe, and tell her that the brydegrome wold sende her no better, or els lyke one that whan the brydegrome had gyuen suche a gold rynge to hys bryde for a token, wold tell her playne and make her byleue that

the Eucharist and his use of the symbol of the ring had been prepared by Ulrich Zwingli.[22]

Though Hoen's use of this image as such is not unusual, it is worthy of note that he used it in a markedly different sense than all the others mentioned. Hoen's interpretation differs from that of the young Bucer and More in that Hoen had given up belief in Christ's bodily presence. In Bernard's sermon and in the English sermon for Corpus Christi (as in Wessel Gansfort's works) the ring is interpreted as a sign of something prospective, as *pignus futurae gloriae*, a pledge of the grace which will be inherited one day in heaven.[23] For Frith and Zwingli the ring is not given by a bridegroom to his bride, but by a family man before his departure for a foreign country; the ring here is a memorial token of somebody absent, just as a widow is reminded of her late husband by the ring he gave her. For Hoen, on the contrary, the ring is the symbol of the promise and pledge which relates to the forgiveness of sins in the present.

Hoen's first argument against the doctrine of transubstantiation and its propagators, the Roman scholastics, is that it implies the sufficiency of a dead and merely historical faith (*fides mortua et historica*). However, those who receive the Eucharist with this faith and not with the living faith with which one receives Christ's ring as a pledge of the forgiveness of sins, eat the manna of the Jews and not the bread of the Eucharist. But man cannot be justified by historical faith. To defend their interpreta-

---

the ryng were but coper or brasse, to mynysshe the brydegromys thanke." On the eucharistic debate between More and Frith, see also L.E. Whatmore, 'A Defender of the Eucharist: Blessed Germain Gardiner, 1544', in *Studia eucharistica DCCi anni a condito festo sanctissimi corporis Christi, 1246–1946* (Bussum–Antwerp, 1946), pp. 246–268.

[22] See the discussion of Zwingli's use of the symbol, *infra*, pp. 208–210.

[23] In late medieval theology the Eucharist was also interpreted as *pignus* of the future Supper in heaven and hence the bread was seen as *pignus futurae gloriae*; see, for example, Gabriel Biel's: "Hinc de pane sacramentali canit ecclesia: 'O sacrum convivium in quo Christus sumitur etc., future glorie nobis pignus dabitur'": *Sermones dominicales de tempore* (Hagenau, 1510) 31 D (cited after Oberman, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology*, p. 277, note 109). Incorrectly, in my opinion, Oberman argued that the word *pignus* in Hoen's *Epistola* should also be interpreted as *pignus futurae gloriae*; see Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation*, p. 277, note 2. A similar view is expressed by Friedhelm Krüger, *Bucer und Erasmus: Eine Untersuchung zum Einfluss des Erasmus auf die Theologie Martin Bucers*. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz, 57 (Wiesbaden, 1970), p. 186, note 14.

tion of the bread as the body of Christ, the scholastics have advanced many subtle reasonings, but none of them has been founded on Scripture.[24]

Rejecting the dogma of transubstantiation on its own arguments, Hoen suggests accepting arbitrarily, for the sake of the present discussion, the scholastics' doctrine—according to which the eucharistic bread is changed into the body of Christ by the priest's consecration—and seeing what objections can then be formulated. As a reprehensible consequence of the scholastics' interpretation Hoen mentions the adoration of the consecrated bread and its veneration as God. Are we, Hoen asks, any different then from the heathens who worshipped wood and stone, supposing the godhead to be in them so that they adored these objects? In Hoen's view the doctrine of transubstantiation results in the adoration and veneration of the host, *i.e.* in paganism. For this reason, this dogma is already objectionable.[25]

Hoen rejects the scholastic defence of transubstantiation with its literal interpretation of the words *hoc est corpus meum*, according to which the bread changes into the body of Christ. But unless we interpret these words correctly, we are like those who follow blind guides and together with them fall into a pit. Hoen reminds his readers of the traditional interpretation of the words "Whatever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven" (*Quodcunque ligaueris*), biblical words used to defend papal tyranny. Hoen argues that upon closer scrutiny these words appear to have been used falsely for that purpose. Hence, the words *Hoc est corpus meum* require close examination as well. Hoen argues that the scholastic interpretation of these words is in contradiction to Christ's saying in Mt 24,23, warning his disciples not to believe those who say, "Here is Christ" or "There is Christ". He does not explain why these words should be applied to the Eucharist, but from this saying he concludes that Christ is not bound to any specific place and hence cannot be *in* the bread. He therefore rejects those who say that Christ is actually present in the bread. Hoen explicitly states his belief that he is living in the times which Christ predicted, when there would be people who would say, "Here is Christ" or "There is Christ".[26]

[24] Ep. 226.27 – 227.3.
[25] Ep. 227.3–8.
[26] Ep. 227.9–19.

The scholastic interpretation of the words *Hoc est corpus meum* loses credibility when it is considered that the apostles did not speak about the sacrament in similar terms: they broke bread, and they called it bread; they did not utter a word about this Roman faith. Finally, Paul's words—although he wrote that the bread which we break is a participation in the body of Christ (ICor 10,16)—do not undermine but rather confirm Hoen's interpretation, as Paul does not state that the bread *is* the body of Christ. From this, Hoen concludes, it is obvious that *Hoc est corpus meum* should be interpreted as *Hoc significat corpus meum*. This inference becomes all the clearer from the comparison Paul draws between the eucharistic bread and the food offered to idols. Paul writes that that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is not changed in reality, but that it nevertheless "is" or "signifies" some sort of communion with the devil.[27]

After advancing these three arguments to refute the traditional interpretation of the words *Hoc est corpus meum*, Hoen reminds his readers of an interpretation current "in the days of St Thomas Aquinas", according to which Christ is in the bread, but only as a sign (*sed tanquam in signo*); that is, not corporeally, but only sacramentally (*sacramentaliter*). Though Thomas rejected this position as heretical and the Romanists hang on his words as if they were an oracle,[28] they cannot dissolve Christ's words: "If anyone says to you that Christ is here, do not believe him", while Paul seems to make the same point when he equates the bread eaten by the desert fathers with the eucharistic bread. Hoen treats this comparison more elaborately later on in his treatise.[29]

The doctrine of the Romanists, Hoen continues, is so strange and astonishing that nothing like it is found in Scripture. We read that Christ became flesh once only, in the womb of the Virgin Mary (*incarnatus*); this incarnation was predicted by the prophets, was demonstrated through Christ in his life and death, and was preached by the apostles. According to Roman doctrine, however, daily and in the hands of a priest, Christ becomes bread (*impanatus*); the prophets did not foretell this, nor did the apostles preach it.[30]

---

[27] Ep. 227.19–29.

[28] See also Erasmus's letter to Albert of Brandenburg of 19 October 1519: "Olim haereticus habebatur qui dissentiebat ab Euangeliis, ab articulis fidei, aut iis que cum his parem obtinerent authoritatem. Nunc si quis vsquam dissentiat a Thoma, vocatur haereticus" (Allen, ep. 1033.234–236).

[29] Ep. 227.30–37.

[30] Ep. 228.1–8.

This doctrine of impanation is commonly founded only on Christ's assertion, *Hoc est corpus meum, hoc facite in mei commemorationem*. But with these words Christ did not mean what they say he did; in many other biblical passages the word 'est' should be interpreted as 'significat'. Hoen mentions Mt 11,14, where Christ says of John the Baptist that he is Elijah, but no-one holds that John actually changed into (transubstantiated into) Elijah. Other examples are John 19,26, where Christ said to his mother Mary about John, "Woman, behold your son", without John being transubstantiated into Christ; Mt 16,18, where Christ, referring to himself (*se demonstrans*), said, "Upon this rock I will build my church", but he was not transubstantiated into a rock, and ICor 10,4, where Paul writes "The rock was Christ", while his intention clearly was not to argue that the rock had transubstantiated into Christ. So, biblical idiom contradicts and refutes the traditional interpretation of the words *Hoc est corpus meum*. If we accept the interpretation that the rock "represented" Christ, why then do we not also accept the interpretation of *Hoc est corpus meum* as *Hoc significat corpus meum*, particularly as Christ adds the admonition to do this "in remembrance of me" and commemoration seems more appropriate for someone who is (corporeally) absent than for someone who is present?

In support of his argumentation, Hoen quotes passages in which Christ is the door, the way, the cornerstone and the vine. To all these and similar passages a very different kind of exegesis is applied than to this one passage; Hoen believes that only long-established usage and the authority of the priests can be the reason for this.[31]

In order to clarify the issue at stake more thoroughly, Hoen next considers three kinds of bread: Christ who is eaten with faith (according

[31] Ep. 228.8–28. It may be worthy of note that some fifty years earlier two priests from the southern Netherlands had proposed a train of thought that is the exact reverse of Hoen's. In 1466 they had preached on the words "Woman, behold your son", and stated that some doctors had held to the opinion that by the inherent power (*virtus transsubstantiandi*) of these words, John had become a natural son of the Virgin, just as the eucharistic bread became Christ's flesh by the *virtus transsubstantiandi* of the words *Hoc est corpus meum*. The inquisitors had patiently explained to them that Christ *de potesta absoluta* could have given that power to those words as well, but that he had not done so and that hence the ideas of the two Franciscans were heretical: Fredericq I, no. 336 (pp. 412–413). The opinion of the two Franciscans was refuted by, among others, Gilles Charlier in his *Sportula fragmentorum* (published in Brussels in 1479); see Émile van Balberghe and Jean-François Gilmont, 'Les théologiens et la "Vauderie" au XVe siècle', in Pierre Cockshaw, Monique-Cécile Garand and Pierre Jodogne, edd., *Miscellanea codicologica F. Masai dicata*, 2 vols. (Gand, 1979), II, pp. 393–411, at p. 408.

to John 6,51), the manna which the fathers ate in the desert and the Christian Eucharist. According to Io 6,48–50, Christ distinguished very clearly between the manna and himself as the bread. The manna *signified* Christ who was to come, but was not Christ himself. The manna did not live, nor did it give life and hence those who ate it died; Christ, however, is the living and vivifying bread: those who eat Christ will live eternally. According to Paul (ICor 10,1–17) the spiritual food of the Israelites is the same as our eucharistic bread: just as the manna signified the bread which was to come (that is, Christ), so the eucharistic bread signifies the bread which has come (that is, Christ). In other words, the eucharistic bread is not the living bread, nor the bread of life (which is Christ); Christ is signified by it. Parallel with this line of thought is Hoen's comparison of the Israelites' passage through the Red Sea with baptism. The Israelites' passage signifies the passage through death to eternal life; not all those who passed through the Red Sea attained this life, only those that died with faith in the coming Christ. By a similar logic, baptism signifies the passage from death to life; not all those baptized attain this life, only those that die with faith in Christ will rise with him. For this reason, Paul admonishes Christians not to pat themselves on the back as if, through baptism or the sacrament of the bread, they have the thing signified, while the Jews had only the sign. It is only through faith active in true love (*fides per charitatem recte operans*; Gal 5,6) that we (as the Jews once did) receive the things signified by the signs.[32]

Hoen adduces yet a further argument against transubstantiation. The scholastics teach that the changed bread retains the substance of Christ's body. This, says Hoen, is not possible, for it becomes corrupted—it is eaten by mice. He refers to Ps 15,10 to say that the body of Christ would not be allowed to be subject to corruption.[33]

Again for the sake of argument, and in order to demonstrate that difficult questions connected to transubstantiation cannot be solved within the traditional theological framework, Hoen admits that Christ by the word of his power could indeed have changed the bread or so united his body with it that it could be said, 'Christ is that which is bread'. (He does so, however, only after adding that nothing like that is found in Scripture.) But even if this be granted, it still would not follow that any priest can do what Christ did. By what words is so much power

[32] Ep. 228.29 – 230.3.
[33] Ep. 230.1–3.

given to men? According to Hoen, the Romanists derive the power to consecrate from the words "This do in remembrance of me". But what interpretation do we give these words? Should they be read as "This which I do, do in remembrance of me" or as "This which you do, do in remembrance of me"? If we accept the first alternative, the interpretation would be uncertain, since we do not know for sure what Christ himself did. According to Erasmus in his annotation on ICor 11, some say that Christ first consecrated the bread and only afterwards spoke the words *Hoc est corpus meum*, referring to the bread already transubstantiated. But, continues Hoen, even if Christ did consecrate the bread by the words *Hoc est corpus meum*, who then would venture to eat the body of Christ without his mandate? And we do not have such a mandate if *Hoc facite* does not refer to the communicants, but to the consecrating priest. If we adopt the second alternative, what then are we supposed to do, as no mortal can provide this body? Do we have to wait till Christ himself comes to us and administers his body to us or sends somebody else who can supply us with what we are commanded to eat, *viz.* his body? If he gave this power to anyone else, by what words then did he do so? The phrase *Hoc facite* cannot mean two things at the same time, nor can the singular *hoc* refer to more than one thing.[34]

Some say that in the words *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*, the celebration by the apostles is demonstrated and since they could only celebrate if somebody administered, the words implicitly suggest that Christ delegated his power of administration to the church, which set apart certain people (the priests). Hoen regards these assertions as fuzzy and unclear. What bread does the priest consecrate by the words *Hoc est corpus meum*? The answer is: only that bread which he designates with the word *hoc*—but the layman, who cannot be sure of the consecrating priest's intention, is forced to believe that Christ is something, when he cannot be sure that it is Christ. Thus the layman can never be certain whether or not he receives the true sacrament. Therefore Hoen does not hesitate to designate this religion as a profound abyss.[35]

Next Hoen examines another aspect of the words of consecration (*Accepit Iesus panem, benedixit, fregit deditque discipulis suis, dicens: Hoc est corpus meum*). The consecrating priest pronounces these words either

[34] Ep. 230.4–31.
[35] Ep. 230.32 – 231.6.

in his own person, in the person of the church or in the person of Christ. If the first option is correct, the priest seems to produce his own body rather than Christ's. The second option would not fit with the words *benedixit, fregit*, which is, rather, a memorial of an act by Christ. Moreover, Christ did not say, 'Do this in my name', but 'This do in remembrance of me'. If these words were spoken in the person of Christ, then the priest would have to say, 'I bless, I break, I give', just as the minister in baptism says, 'I baptize you in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit'. A combination of the first and third options (the consecrating priest speaks first in his own person the words *benedixit, fregit, deditque discipulis suis*, but the following words in the person of Christ) is not possible either: in that case, the word *effundetur* in the blessing of the cup would have to be *qui effusus est.* Or it could be that these words are spoken in yet another person, which is contrary to "common sense" (*sensus communis*). In short, everything the Romanists interject is obscure and wavering and upheld only by human propositions. It is, therefore, better to stick with Christ's straightforward saying (*verbum simplicissimum*): "If anyone says to you, 'Here is Christ', do not believe him" (Mt 24,23).[36]

What renders the Romanist faith even more suspect is that their doctrine does not occur in the Apostolic Creed, while it is painstakingly discussed in the papal Decretals. The absence of the dogma in the Apostolic Creed strengthens the suspicion that it is a papal or rather a satanic invention. Christ taught us that he is served only by faith, and withdrew his bodily presence in order to make this easier as well as to make way for the Comforter, the Holy Spirit. Yet Satan, perverting all things, attempts to convince us of the bodily presence of Christ in the form of bread. All the external pomp of the Roman Catholic church is the reprehensible consequence of this doctrine; when taken away, the entire religion of the pope will collapse, as it has already collapsed to a great extent.[37]

Returning to his earlier remark that *est* should be interpreted as *significat*, Hoen states that, in biblical idiom, *est* is regularly used instead of *significat*, since *est* expresses more certainly and more forcefully the intended meaning, just as we refer more clearly to the first sign of rain by saying "this *is* rain", rather than by saying "this *signifies* rain". Scripture abounds in similar examples. In Pharaoh's dreams, as recorded in

[36] Ep. 231.7–26.
[37] Ep. 231.27 – 232.13.

Gen 40 and Gen 41, the three branches, the three baskets and the seven good cows and the seven full ears are said to *be* three days and seven prosperous years respectively.[38]

Neither does Hoen consider the alleged miracle of transubstantiation to come up to the standards of biblical miracles. Christ did not perform miracles contrary to the experience of the senses; he opened the eyes of the blind, raised the dead and healed lepers, but he did this so that it was clear to all that they were healed, alive and sighted. The 'miracle' of transubstantiation is evidently against experience as bread plainly remains bread. The pope and his entourage perform many such miracles. They make out of the worst wretch, pander or robber a holy father and reverend bishop. Again, we do not see by experience that they have become holier and wiser, but we are supposed to believe that they are holier and wiser (just as we are to believe that the bread has been changed into Christ's body, though we cannot see that by experience either). The pope performs similar miracles when he liberates souls from purgatory or remits (perhaps for money) part or even all of the punishment imposed for sins. Arguing from the assumption that times of plague and war are God's punishment for sin, Hoen states that these 'miracles' are also contrary to all experience, since in times of plague and war those whose guilt has been remitted suffer no less than those who have had no remission.[39]

From this argument, Hoen again concludes that we should distinguish between the bread received by the mouth and Christ who is received by faith. If someone did not discern Christ's body, thinking that he ate nothing more than what he took by mouth, he was answerable to Christ's body and blood and ate and drank his own judgment; by his eating and drinking he showed that Christ was present with him, but by his own unbelief he separated himself from Christ. May the Lord, Hoen exclaimed, have mercy upon us: how great is our abomination![40]

Next, the *Epistola* draws a comparison between the elevation and veneration of the golden calf by the people of Israel (Ex 32,4) and the consecrated host which is also venerated as God.[41] Nor should credence be given to those who claim that Christ's body is in the bread as fire

[38] Ep. 232.27–34.
[39] Ep. 232.34 – 233.12.
[40] Ep. 233.13–19.
[41] Ep. 233.19–26.

pervades iron (*sicut ignis in ferro*), unless we want to close our ears to the word of Christ in Mt 24,23.[42]

According to Mt 4,4, Christians should not live by the words *Hoc est corpus meum* alone, but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God. On the words *Hoc est corpus meum* so many books have been written that they can hardly be read in a month. But this state of affairs is the fault of Christians who have forsaken the fountain of living waters for old cisterns (Jer 2,13). They should listen to the whole word of God and only to the word of God; nothing has been left free to them, not even those things which Christ did not explicitly forbid. As a social argument against a one-sided concentration on the Eucharist, it is further stated that it is of no use to your brother if you eat every consecrated host and drink every cup of wine. Besides, Christ's will is abundantly revealed in his speech at the Last Supper (as recorded in Io 13–18) and briefly in the Sermon on the Mount. The seriousness of the historical situation is revealed by the fact that in the past one said, 'I am of Thomas, I am of Scotus, I am of Jerome, Augustine, Franciscus etc.', but now people say 'I am Christ', while their lives are sinful. As long as we believe in Christ's corporeal presence, the Holy Spirit will not be with us.

At the very end of the treatise, it is stated that soon a more elaborate treatment of the eating of Christ's body and the drinking of his blood will be published. In the meantime, the reader is exhorted to pray lest his faith weakens and he fails to hear Christ's voice.[43]

2. Vt recitat Erasmus: *the relationship between Erasmus's* Annotationes in Nouum Testamentum *and Hoen's* Epistola

In the preceding chapter, it was concluded that Hoen and Erasmus knew each other, although not personally. Hoen figures in the great humanist's correspondence and may have been the recipient of a letter written by him. Whatever this relationship may have been, Hoen explicitly referred to Erasmus's *Annotationes* on the New Testament in his treatise.[44] What traces of Erasmus's monumental work can be discerned

[42] Ep. 233.27–29.

[43] Ep. 233.30 – 235.4.

[44] The first edition appeared in Basel in 1516 under the title of *Novum Instrumentum*; later editions, entitled *Novum Testamentum*, appeared in 1519, 1522, 1527 and 1535. See Johanna J.M. Meyers, *Authors Edited, Translated or Annotated by Desiderius Erasmus: A Short-title Catalogue of the Works in the City Library of Rotterdam* (Rotterdam, 1982), pp. 163–165.

in Hoen's epistle? Hoen mentions Erasmus's annotation on ICor 11; other places which prove worthy of examination are Mt 24,23, Mt 16,18 and ICor 10,4.[45]

When for the first time in his treatise Hoen propounds his interpretation of *Hoc est corpus meum* as *Hoc significat corpus meum*, he continues his exposition with the following remark:

> "There were some in the time of Thomas Aquinas who said on this issue that Christ was in the bread, but only as a sign (what others called only sacramentally and not corporeally); and though Thomas rejected this opinion as heretical, the Romanists, who hang on his words as if they were an oracle, cannot dissolve Christ's words: 'If anyone says to you that Christ is here, do not believe him'".[46]

The 1516 edition has seen a facsimile edition: Erasmus von Rottterdam, *Novum Instrumentum*. Faksimile-Neudruck [der Ausgabe] Basel 1516 mit einer historischen, textkritischen und bibliographischen Einleitung von Heinz Holeczek (Stuttgart–Bad Cannstatt, 1986), while Anne Reeve and Michael Screech have edited a three-volume facsimile of the 1535 edition of Erasmus's *Annotationes*, to which in the margin most variants, changes, additions and omissions are noted calligraphically: *Erasmus' Annotations on the New Testament*. Facsimile of the final Latin text (1535) with all earlier variants (1516, 1519, 1522, 1527), edited by Anne Reeve, introduction by M.A. Screech, calligraphy by Patricia Payn (London, 1986; Leiden, 1990 and 1993).

Primarily, the purpose of his edition of the New Testament (on which he worked from 1512 at the latest) was to give a *castigatio*, *emendatio* or *correctio* of the current Latin translation of the Bible, the Vulgate; to his new version Erasmus added the Greek text in order to enable the reader to verify his translation, as well as annotations to give a philological justification of the rendering he had chosen. See H.J. de Jonge, 'The Character of Erasmus' Translation of the New Testament as Reflected in his Translation of Hebrews 9', *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 14 (1984) 81–87 and H.J. de Jonge, '*Novum Testamentum a nobis versum*: The Essence of Erasmus' Edition of the New Testament', *Journal of Theological Studies* 35 (1984) 394–413 and H.J. de Jonge, 'The Date and Purpose of Erasmus's *Castigatio Novi Testamenti*: A Note on the Origins of the *Novum Instrumentum*', in A.C. Dionisotti, Anthony Grafton and Jill Kraye, edd., *The Uses of Greek and Latin: Historical Essays*. Warburg Institute Surveys and Texts, 16 (London, 1988), pp. 97–110.

[45] The first to trace the influence of Erasmus's *Annotationes* on Hoen's *Epistola* was J. Trapman, *De Summa der godliker scrifturen (1523)*, pp. 116–117. Trapman, however, founded his inquiries on the Leiden edition of Erasmus's *Opera* (1703–1706; repr. Hildesheim, 1961–1962), which contains the latest editions of his works which appeared during his lifetime, with no *apparatus criticus*. As a result, Trapman has overestimated Erasmus's influence, as he pointed out traces of Erasmus's annotations in Hoen's treatise which Hoen cannot have known as they appeared for the first time in the 1527 or 1535 editions. In his critical edition of Hoen's *Epistola*, Finsler also referred to the Leiden edition of Erasmus's works: Z IV, p. 515, note 1.

[46] Ep. 227.30–35.

Further on in his treatise Hoen discusses the words of institution, asking the question—assuming that Christ did transubstantiate the bread into his body—what right any priest has to perform the same miracle. The words of institution do not give that kind of authority to men. If these words should be interpreted as "This which I do, do in remembrance of me", the solution still remains uncertain as we do not know what Christ did do:

> "As Erasmus argues in his annotation to ICor 11, some say that Christ first consecrated the bread and only afterwards pronounced the words *Hoc est corpus meum* with reference to the bread already transubstantiated."[47]

In the 1516 edition of his *Annotationes* Erasmus had not yet given this information. At the words *hoc est corpus meum* he noted only that the *verbum substantivum* (linking verb) 'est' was lacking in the Greek text, though he had found it added in some manuscripts.[48] The passage cited by Hoen occurs for the first time in the 1519 edition (and has been maintained in all subsequent editions),[49] when Erasmus added the following words:

> "Thomas says that there have been people who held that Christ consecrated with other words [than with the words *Hoc est corpus meum*] and then said to his disciples: 'This is my body'. And though he refutes this opinion, he does not call it heretical; he called heretical the opinion of those who stated that the body of Christ is not verily in the sacrament of the Eucharist, but as in a sign."[50]

While the first part of this quotation refers to Thomas's *Summa* III, q. 78, art. 1, Erasmus is here referring to *Summa* III, q. 75, art. 1. Thomas mentioned Berengar as the person who had propounded that Christ was present in the Eucharist *sicut in signo*,[51] but as Erasmus did not mention the eleventh-century theologian and wrote only that

---

[47] Ep. 230.16–19.

[48] Edition 1516, annotatio in ICor 11,24 (*Hoc est corpus meum*): "i.[e.] hoc meum corpus, absque verbo substantivo 'est'. Quamquam in quibusdam additum reperio."

[49] Thus it may be inferred that Hoen composed his *Epistola* after 1519 and had (as he died in 1524/1525) either the 1519 or the 1522 edition on his desk. As Rode (as will be shown in the next chapter) probably took Hoen's letter to Luther early in 1521, Hoen must have used the 1519 edition.

[50] "Fatetur Thomas fuisse, qui dicerent Christum aliis verbis consecrasse panem, prius quam porrigens discipulis diceret: 'hoc est corpus meum'. Et eam opinionem licet refellat, non tamen vocat haereticam, cum haereticam dicat eorum, qui contendebant corpus Christi non esse vere in sacramento synaxeos, sed velut in signo."

[51] Trapman, *De Summa der godliker scrifturen (1523)*, p. 116.

according to Thomas *some people* had proposed this interpretation, Hoen assumed that Thomas was writing about contemporaries.[52]

In the first part of this chapter it has been argued that Hoen's appeal to Mt 24,23 is the core and heart of his treatise. Erasmus's annotations on this verse are unlikely to have inspired Hoen's interpretation. In the 1516 edition Erasmus remarked only that the word 'hic' (*Tunc si quis vobis dixerit, ecce* hic *Christus aut ilic, nolite credere*) is an adverb and not a demonstrative pronoun (*ille* Christus): "neque enim significat quemvis unctum e multis, sed unicum illum qui ab omnibus expectabatur". In the next edition, following Augustine, he used this text to protest against the "schism of the heretics". In his day, according to Erasmus, all monastic orders exclaimed, "Here is Christ!", but Christ here encourages us to disbelieve them. Is Christ not present "ubicunque sunt affectus Christo digni"?[53] In the 1522 edition Erasmus to some degree expanded his indictment against monasticism,[54] while in 1527 he hastened to add that he had had in mind only superstituous, not pious, monks[55] and that his critique did not imply a condemnation of all ceremony. He did

---

[52] Thomas, *Summa theologica* III, quaestio 75, articulus 1: "Et quia fides est invisibilium, sicut divinitatem suam nobis exhibet Christus invisibiliter, ita et in hoc sacramento carnem suam nobis exhibet invisibili modo. Quae quidam non attendentes, posuerunt corpus et sanguinem Christi non esse in hoc sacramento nisi sicut in signo. Quod est tanquam haereticum abiiciendum, utpote verbis Christi contrarium. Unde et Berengarius, qui primus inventor huius erroris fuerat, postea coactus est suum errorem revocare, et veritatem fidei confiteri.". From this passage it may thus be inferred that Hoen himself did not study Thomas's *Summa*.

[53] Edition 1519, annotatio in Mt 24,23: "Hunc locum ennarans divus Augustinus in quaestionibus evangelicis, recte quidem interpretatum, his verbis excludi schismata haereticorum, sed cavendum est, ne ad nos quoque pertineant, qui nobis orthodoxi videmur. Audimus monachos passim clamantes, 'Ecce, Christus hic est', nec hos tamen inter se consentire. Observantes dicunt, apud Coletas et Conventuales non est Christus, sed hic est. Rursus Benedicti clamant, 'hic est Christus, non apud Mendicantes'. Tot undique voces obstrepunt clamantium, 'hic est Christus'. Sed quid ait ipse Christus? 'Nolite credere'. Nusquam non est Christus, ubicunque sunt affectus Christo digni. Vult ille communis esse omnium, qui sol est mundi. Non dignatur circumscribi loco non includi titulis humanis, aut cultu, ceremoniisve." For the reference to Augustine, see *Quaestiones Euangeliorum*, XXXVIII (MPL 35, pp. 1323–1332, at pp. 1330–1331). As will be demonstrated in the course of this chapter, Luther applied this text to monasticism as well, while Karlstadt, Bucer and Oecolampadius (like Hoen) connected these words to the Eucharist.

[54] Edition 1522, *ibidem*: "Jacobitae clamant, 'hic est Christus, apud Augustinienses non est' […] Denique clamant hoc genus omne, 'hic est Christus, apud sacerdotes, qui cucullam non gestant, Christus non est'."

[55] Edition 1527, *ibidem*: "monachos […], de superstitiosis loquor, non de piis."

not condemn those ceremonies "quae conducunt ad pietatem": "dissidium damno et superstitiosam fiduciam".[56] Moreover, in the 1527 edition Erasmus noted that Christ is not divided: "Non est divisus Christus, non est in rebus corporalibus". Such an expression could have influenced Hoen's interpretation of the text[57] only if it had appeared in an edition of the *Annotationes* which Hoen might have known. In conclusion, we must state that there is no connection whatsoever between Hoen's application of this text to the Eucharist and Erasmus's annotations on it.

In the first four editions of his *Annotationes* Erasmus, in his annotation to ICor 10,4, confined himself to several purely philological remarks in order to defend his translation, which differs from the Vulgate.[58] It was only in the 1535 edition that he inserted a quotation from Augustine, which stated that the words "petra erat Christus" should be interpreted as "petra significat Christum".[59] Thus this annotation left no trace in Hoen's treatise.[60]

The same is true of Erasmus's annotation to Mt 16,18. Propounding his opinion that Christ when speaking the words 'hoc est corpus meum' did not transubstantiate the bread into his actual body, Hoen also appealed to similar biblical texts in which the word 'est' is used but not given that interpretation. When Christ said of John, "He is Elias" (Mt 11,14), John was not transubstantiated into Elias. John the Evangelist did not change into Christ when Christ said to his mother, "Behold thy son"; neither did Christ change into a stone when, referring to himself (*se demonstrans*), he said, "Upon this rock I will build my church".[61]

---

[56] Edition 1527, *ibidem*: "Hic denuo testandum est, me non damnare ceremonias quae conducunt ad pietatem, dissidium damno et superstitiosam fiduciam."

[57] Trapman, *De Summa der godliker scrifturen (1523)*, p. 117, argued that Hoen could have known and incorporated this annotation.

[58] The Vulgate reads: "Bibebant autem de spirituali consequente eos petra: Petra autem erat Christus"; Erasmus translated: "Bibebant autem de spirituali, quae illos comitabatur, petra: petra vero fuit Christus".

[59] Edition 1535, annotatio in ICor 10,4: "Et Augustinus quum aliis aliquot locis, tum contra adversarium legis et prophetarum libro secundo, capite sexto, interpretatur, Christus erat petra, id est petra significabat Christum: nec obstat quod hanc petram dixerit spiritualem. Quicquid enim mysticum habet sensum, spirituale dicimus. Bibebant aquam de petra, non qualibet, sed de spirituali, quae significabat illam vnicam petram, vnde salutem hauriunt omnes credentes."

[60] Cf. Trapman, *De Summa der godliker scrifturen (1523)*, p. 117.

[61] Ep. 228.11–17.

From the first edition of his *Annotationes* onwards, Erasmus stated that Christ called Peter a rock because of his steadfast faith, and it was on this faith that Christ wanted to build his church.[62] Erasmus, however, added a second explanation, one given by Augustine, who had applied the words *super hanc petram* to Christ himself and not to Peter. Christ, according to Augustine, had said, "super meipsum filium dei vivi, aedificabo ecclesiam meam. Super me aedificabo te, non me super te".[63] This is in accordance with Hoen's exposition,[64] but in the course of this chapter it will become clear that the appeal to Mt 16,18 to defend a non-literal interpretation of the words *hoc est corpus meum* was a commonly used argument (and refuted by, for example, Lombardus, as well as by Gabriel Biel), and for that reason Erasmus's annotations in all probability are not Hoen's actual source.

Just as Hoen's indebtedness to Erasmus's annotations proves meagre, he apparently did not derive his biblical references from Erasmus's new Latin translation either. A few examples may suffice to demonstrate this. Whereas with Hoen and the Vulgate ICor 10,16 reads "Nonne panis quem frangimus, participatio corporis Domini est?", Erasmus translates "Panis quem frangimus, nonne *communicatio* corporis Christi est?" (italics added). ICor 10,4, in Hoen and in the Vulgate, is translated as "petra (autem) erat Christus"; Erasmus has "petra vero fuit Christus". ICor 10,6 reads "ne simus concupiscentes malorum" (Hoen, Vulgate) and "ne nos simus concupiscentes rerum malarum" (Erasmus), while Io 6,50 reads "si quis ex ipso manducauerit, non morietur" (Hoen, Vulgate) and "vt ex ipso manducaret aliquis et non moriatur" (Erasmus).[65]

---

[62] Edition of 1516, annotatio in Mt 16,18: "Saxum enim appellat, quod solidus sit in confessione fidei et non vulgarum opinionem leuitate huc et illuc vacillet: et super istam petram, hoc est solidam istam fidei professionem extruam ecclesiam meam."

[63] Edition of 1516, *ibidem*: "Etiamsi diuus Augustinus in homilia huius loci, haec verba 'super hanc petram', ipsi accomodat Christo, non Petro: 'Tu es', inquit, 'Petrus, et super hanc petram quam confessus es, super hanc petram quam cognovisti, dicens: Tu es Christus filius Dei vivi, aedificabo ecclesiam meam, id est, super meipsum filum Dei vivi aedificabo ecclesiam meam, super me aedificabo te, non me super te'." For Augustine, see *Sermo* LXXVI,1 (MPL 38, pp. 479–483, at p. 479).

[64] See Trapman, *De Summa der godliker scrifturen (1523)*, p. 117.

[65] See Ep. 227.22–23, 228.23–26, 229.28–32, 228.34 – 229.1 respectively; I have cited Erasmus from the reprint of the 1516 edition (see *supra*, note 44), the Vulgate from *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*, Robertus Weber *et alii*, edd., 2 vols. (3rd ed.; Stuttgart, 1983).

Though Erasmus's *Annotationes* did leave their mark in Hoen's treatise, the reply must be negative to the question of whether or not he derived some of his distinctive ideas (his appeal to Mt 24,23, his interpretation of 'est' as 'significat', his idea of the sacrament as an effective sign and pledge of the *promissio remissionis peccatorum*) or inspirations from this source. Moreover, Erasmus never abandoned his belief in Christ's bodily presence in the Eucharist—in 1530, for example, he edited Alger of Liège's *De veritate corporis et sanguinis Dominici in eucharistia.*[66] Nevertheless, Hoen and Erasmus should be regarded as kindred souls. Erasmus maintained the real presence in the Eucharist but, on the other hand, he emphasized the subjective element by stressing the importance of an active faith. This emphasis is closely connected to the structure of Erasmus's spirituality, as reflected, for example, in his *Enchiridion militis Christiani.*[67] In this manual he explains that self-knowledge is a prerequisite for the practise of a Christian life.[68] This self-knowledge begins with the idea that man in his soul is part of the godly world, but in his body he belongs to the animal world. This duality between the visible and invisible worlds (between flesh/body and spirit, temporal and eternal, darkness and light) dominates the entire treatise; the Christian, being part of both worlds, should transcend the visible world into the invisible one.[69] This basic assumption, though it did not lead into an absolute rejection of all things earthly and visible or of ecclesiastical (external) ceremonies, nevertheless reduces their importance: external ceremonies are only considered useful when the correct disposition of heart is present. When applied to the Eucharist, these assumptions imply that the outward celebration of Mass is part of the lower, visible world and that Christ's body and blood should be eaten and drunk spiritually as well: "contempsit [Christus] et carnis suae manducationem et sanguinis potum, nisi et spiritualiter edatur atque bibatur". In connection with Christ's Ascension, Erasmus added "nempe obstat caro Christi, atque

[66] Allen, ep. 2284; on Erasmus's view of the Eucharist, see John B. Payne, *Erasmus: His Theology of the Sacraments* (Richmond, Va., 1970), pp. 126–154, and see also C. Reedijk, 'Erasmus' Final Modesty', in *Actes du congrès Érasme* (Amsterdam, 1971), pp. 174–192, at pp. 181, 186.

[67] LB V, pp. 1–66. See Cornelis Augustijn, *Erasmus: His Life, Works, and Influence* (Toronto, 1991), pp. 43–55.

[68] "Caput autem huius sapientiae esse puta, vt temetipsum noris"; "Est igitur homo prodigiosum quoddam animal ex duabus tribusve partibus multo divertissimis compactum, ex anima veluti numine quodam et corpore tanquam muta pecude."

[69] "Addamus […] regulam […], si coneris semper a rebus visibilibus […] ad invisibilia proficere […]."

inde est quod ille dicit: 'Nisi ego abiero, Paracletus non veniet. Expedit vobis vt ego vadam.' Christi corporea praesentia inutilis ad salutem, et in vlla praeterea re corporali audebimus perfectam pietatem statuere?" When compared with Hoen's words in his *Epistola*: "Christus […] qui docuit […] ipsi […] serviendum in spiritu per fidem, et quo hoc facilius fieret, corporalem nobis praesentiam subtraxit, quam obesse discipulis suis testatus est, dicens: 'Si non abiero, Paracletus non veniet'",[70] these parallel passages suggest that the spirituality propagated by Erasmus constitutes one of the backgrounds of Hoen's treatise.

By inserting a philological annotation by Erasmus, Hoen may have earned a place among the 'humanist Christians' (J. IJsewijn) who wanted to attain a renewal of church and theology by means of the philological study of the *sacrae litterae*. Erasmus's (at first sight) purely theological annotation to ICor 11,24 certainly refers to his earlier annotation on Mk 14,24 ("And he took the cup, and when he gave thanks, he gave it to them and they all drank of it; and he said to them, 'This is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many'"). In the 1519 edition Erasmus remarked "Those that know so surely with which words Christ consecrated (and there is no clarity on that in the text) should pay attention to this passage: the way in which the story is told here suggests that Christ first offered the chalice and after they had drunk finally spoke the words: 'This is the chalice etc.'." Solely on the foundation of a grammatical interpretation of the event described, Erasmus cast doubt on the words of institution as a formula of consecration. This doubt is also reflected in his annotation on ICor 11,24. Hoen used this to propose, in a purely negative part of his exposition, that the words of institution are not a formula of consecration and hence could not effect transubstantiation. An age-old argument (already mentioned and refuted by Thomas) was given a grammatical foundation in Erasmus's annotation.

Yet, in his annotation on ICor 11,24, after having cast doubt on the original form of the consecration formula, Erasmus pointed to the authority of the church and its teachings, to which human reason must submit as the only possible escape from this uncertainty. Hoen, significantly, rejected this solution; apparently, ecclesiastical traditions were no longer authoritative for him.

---

[70] Ep. 231.34 – 232.3; Trapman, *De Summa der godliker scrifturen (1523)*, p. 117, was the first to notice these parallel passages.

Erika Rummel has remarked that Erasmus's annotations on the Eucharist raise more questions than they answer.[71] In the first instance Erasmus was no theologian, but a philologist (*grammaticus*, *rhetor*, *orator*), who in the words of Horace said of himself (in his *Methodus* as well as in his *Ratio seu methodus compendio perueniendi ad veram theologiam*):

> fungar vice cotis, acutum reddere quae ferrum valet, excors ipsa secandi[72]

and who was forced to develop into a theologian as a result of the many controversies provoked by his work on the New Testament.[73] This is in complete accordance with the fact that Hoen's dependence on Erasmus appears only in a purely negative passage—other criticisms, as well as inspirations for his positive view of the sacrament, were developed with the help of different sources.

3. *The Decretals and the Roman Scholastics*

In Hoen's opinion the faith of the 'Romanists' is suspect because the doctrine of transubstantiation is not mentioned in the Apostolic Creed and was not discussed until the papal Decretals.[74] Hoen refers to the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX (1227–1241) which contain Innocent III's definition of the doctrine of transubstantion as formulated at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, according to which the body and blood of Christ are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the species of bread and wine, the bread having been transubstantiated into the body and the wine into the blood of Christ by the priest's consecration.[75] Though the (alleged) dogmatization of transubstantiation in 1215

---

[71] Erika Rummel, *Erasmus' Annotations on the New Testament: From Philologist to Theologian* (Toronto, 1986), p. 157.

[72] Horace, *Ars poetica*, 304–305.

[73] See Rummel, *Erasmus' Annotations on the New Testament: From Philologist to Theologian*.

[74] Ep. 231.29–30.

[75] X I,i,1,par.3: "Vna vero est fidelium vniuersalis ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino saluatur, in qua idem ipse sacerdos est sacrificium Jesus Christus, cuius corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transubstantiatis pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem potestate diuina, vt ad perficiendum mysterium vnitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo quod accepit ipse de nostro." See Friedberg II, p. 6 and Antonio García y García, ed., *Constitutiones Concilii quarti Lateranensis vna cum Commentariis glossatorum*. Monumenta iuris canonici, series A: Corpus glossatorum, 2 (Vatican City, 1981), p. 42.31–37. On the history of the dogma of transubstantiation, see John Cosin, *Historia transsubstantiationis papalis* (London, 1675); Pierre Alix, 'Historia

might suggest the existence of universal agreement on the exact meaning of the concept, there was actually no common understanding of either the use or the meaning of the term 'transubstantiation' at the time of the Fourth Lateran Council.

Roughly three camps of theologians can be distinguished: those who adhered to 'consubstantiation', to 'annihilation' and to 'transubstantiation'; the first two of these theories were not at first considered heterodox.[76] Mainly through the influence of the theologians of the mendicant orders, it was only by the fifteenth century that 'consubstantiation' (as defended, for example, by John Wyclif) was rejected as an orthodox opinion. Hoen, although he did not clearly distinguish the three theories, implicitly criticized all of them. He refuted the theory according to which the substance of bread and wine is changed into the substance of the body and blood at the words of consecration, dismissed the doctrine of 'impanation' which teaches the 'annihilation' of the substance of bread and wine, and did not believe that the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist were coexistent with the bread and wine. His position, however, is closest to the last doctrine, as the discussion of his judicial images shows; to Hoen the bread was an effective sign and pledge of Christ's promise of the forgiveness of sins, but it did not become the vehicle of Christ's body, as Christ was bodily absent from the Eucharist.

Hoen also challenged the statement in the same chapter of the Decretals which says that the change of bread and wine into Christ's body and blood takes place at the consecration of the priest. His objection was that the priest could not do what Christ was (incorrectly) believed to have done, *viz.* to have changed the bread into his very body: their power to do so was not backed by the alleged words of consecration. Hoen's analysis in this part of his exposition was in fact a scholastic argument to show that many complicated questions about the Eucharist could not be solved within the traditional theological framework. Any solution advanced by the Roman scholastics was, in

---

transsubstantiationis', in Pierre Alix, ed., *Determinatio Fr. Joannis Parisiensis de modo existendi corpus Christi in sacramento altaris* (London, 1686); Hans Jorissen, *Die Entfaltung der Transsubstantiationslehre bis zum Beginn der Hochscholastik*. Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie, 28/1 (Münster, 1965); Gary Macy, 'The Dogma of Transubstantiation in the Middle Ages', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 45 (1994) 11–41.

[76] See Jorissen, *Die Entfaltung der Transsubstantiationslehre bis zum Beginn der Hochscholastik*, pp. 25–44.

Hoen's opinion, logically untenable. In this part of his treatise Hoen opposed the scholastic argumentation as reflected in, among others, the third part of the *Decretum Gratiani*, devoted to consecration[77] (which, as a jurist, he was well acquainted with) and such standard theological books as Thomas's *Summa theologica*. By means of a stringent *reductio*, Hoen wanted to make room for what he called "the simple words of Christ" in Mt 24,23.

According to traditional church doctrine, Christ by consecrating the bread and wine transubstantiated them into his body and blood; afterwards only those who have been legally ('*rite*') ordained (the priests) have the mandate to perform this rite, and the priests perform transubstantiation by pronouncing the words of consecration: *Accepit Iesus panem, benedixit, fregit deditque discipulis suis, dicens: 'Hoc est corpus meum. Hoc facite in meam commemorationem.*'[78] Hoen, however, subjects these words to a closer examination, first by analyzing the possible meaning of the word 'hoc' in the phrase *hoc facite in meam commemorationem*. His objection, that the interpretation 'This which I do, do in remembrance of me' cannot be correct as what Christ actually did is not known, is not a very original thought. Thomas had already advanced it in his *Summa*, repeating the opinion that Christ first blessed the bread and only afterwards pronounced the words *Accipite et comedite: hoc est corpus meum.*[79] As noted, Erasmus had also voiced this opinion in his annotation on ICor 11,24 and had given it a grammatical foundation in his annotation on Mk 14,24. Hoen gratefully repeated it as yet another argument in his exposition. However Thomas, in his answer to this objection, argued that on this subject there were many opinions. Some said that Christ by his majestic power first celebrated the Eucharist without verbal formulae (*absque omni forma verborum*) and then pronounced the words posterity had to use to bless the bread and wine. Innocent III had voiced

[77] See John H. van Engen, 'Observations on "De consecratione"', in Stephan Kuttner and Kenneth Pennington, edd., *Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Medieval Canon Law*. Monumenta iuris canonici, series C: Subsidia, 7 (Vatican City, 1985), pp. 309–320.

[78] X I,i,1,par.3: "Et hoc vtique sacramentum nemo potest conficere, nisi sacerdos, qui rite fuerit ordinatus, secundum claues ecclesiae, quas ipse concessit apostolis eorumque successoribus Iesus Christus" (Friedberg II, p. 6; García y García, ed., *Constitutiones concilii quarti Lateranensis*, p. 42.37–43.1); X III,xli,6 (Friedberg II, pp. 636–639); Gratian III,ii,55 (Friedberg I, pp. 1334–1335); Lombard IV,10,2; Thomas, *Summa* III,82,1 and III,82,3.

[79] Thomas, *Summa*, III,78,1.

this idea,[80] but his words, according to Thomas, simply reflected Innocent's personal opinion (*opinatiue*) and did not lay down a standard (*determinatiue*) because the Gospels clearly state that Christ spoke words of benediction. Others said[81] that Christ blessed the bread with other words unknown to us, but this interpretation was not satisfactory to Thomas either, as the words of benediction need to be the same as the words Christ used then. Others again[82] solved this puzzle by arguing that Christ used the words of benediction but pronounced them twice, once secretly to consecrate the bread, then openly to instruct his disciples. Thomas also rejected this proposal, as the priest pronounces the words of consecration openly, which must be in imitation of Christ's behaviour then. Following Augustine,[83] Thomas argued that the evangelists did not use the same *ordo* (sequence) in their narration of the events which took place at the Last Supper. The actual course of events, he concluded, could be reproduced in the following paraphrase: *Dum benediceret et frangeret et daret discipulis suis, haec verba dixit [Christus]: Accipite* etc.

If, Hoen concedes, Christ did indeed consecrate the bread with the alleged words of consecration, then we have no mandate to eat his body, because in that case the words *Hoc facite* are directed to the consecrating priest and not to the communicants. And if we interpret the words of consecration as 'This which you do, do in remembrance of me', we are again at a dead end, as in that case there is nobody to administer Christ's body (the words *Hoc facite* can evidently mean only one thing at the same time and the singular 'hoc' cannot refer to more than one thing). The reply, that these words implicitly suggest that Christ delegated his power of administration to the priests who are ordained by the church, is equally rejected by Hoen. What bread, he asks, does the priest intend to consecrate when he pronounces the words *Hoc est corpus meum*? In the *Summa* it is stated that the priest, by pronouncing the words of consecration with the intention of performing the sacrament, actually celebrates it.[84] But Hoen objects that no layman can be sure about the priest's intention and therefore he is forced to believe that Christ is something about which he cannot possibly be

[80] Innocent III, *De sacro altaris mysterio* IV,6 (MPL 217, pp. 763–916, at p. 859).
[81] *E.g.* Odo Caeracensis, *In canonem missae*, 3 (MPL 160, p. 1061).
[82] *E.g.* Stephanus Augustinensis, *De sacramento altaris*, 14 (MPL 172, p. 1245).
[83] *De consensu euangelistarum* II, 21, 30 and 34 (MPL 34, pp. 1102, 1111, 1123).
[84] Thomas, *Summa* III,78,1 (resp. to obj. 4).

sure—he cannot know that it really is Christ. Most radically, Hoen typifies all scholastic arguments as sophisms, blurred and fuzzy; the religion of the Roman scholastics was to Hoen a deep abyss.

The next question Hoen raises is, in whose person is the consecrating priest held to pronounce the words of consecration: in his own, in Christ's, or in the person of the church? This, too, is not unconventional. In Thomas's *Summa* the objection is made that in the formula of baptism (*Ego te baptizo*) the person who administers baptism and his act are clearly defined; in the words of consecration, however, they are not mentioned at all and thus cannot be *forma sacramenti*.[85] Elsewhere it is objected that the priest should properly say, *Hoc est corpus Christi* (and thus pronounce the words in his own person) because the nature of the thing converted, Christ's body, is determined, for which reason the person, Christ, should likewise be determined. In response to this objection Thomas states that the pronoun 'meum' refers to the first person singular and that therefore the person of Christ is indicated as the speaking person.[86] In the *Decretum Gratiani* it is likewise stated that the priest when pronouncing the words of consecration uses the words of Christ and thus speaks in his person.[87] Such considerations, however, would have been unconvincing to Hoen. He contended that the phrase *Accepit Iesus panem, benedixit, fregit deditque discipulis suis, dicens: Hoc est corpus meum* was a description of an historical incident, while Christ, moreover, added the command to celebrate it in his remembrance. Nor can the priest speak in his own person, for in that case his pronouncement of the words *Hoc est corpus meum* would produce his own body rather than Christ's. If he speaks in Christ's person, he would have to say, *Benedico, frango et do*…, just as the administerer of baptism says, *Ego baptizo*. The opinion formulated in Gratian, *viz.* that the consecrating priest in his own person speaks the words *benedixit* etc. but the ensuing phrase *hoc est corpus meum* in the person of Christ[88] is not satisfactory either, as in that case the word *effundetur* in the blessing of the cup would have to be *qui*

---

[85] Thomas, *Summa* III,78,1,3.

[86] Thomas, *Summa* III,78,2 (4).

[87] *Decretum Gratiani* III,ii,55 (Friedberg I, pp. 1334–1335). The classical reference is to Ambrose, *De sacramentis* IV,4 (CSEL 73, pp. 13–85, at pp. 51–53).

[88] *Decretum Gratiani* III,ii,55: "[…] Ubi autem sacramentum conficitur, iam non suis sermonibus sacerdos, sed vtitur sermonibus Christi" (= Ambrose, *De sacramentis* IV,4 [CSEL 73, p. 52.13–15]).

effusus est. In short, all possible solutions are merely based on obscure and wavering propositions. In contrast, Christ's command (Mt 24,23) not to believe those who will say that he is actually present somewhere on earth, as in the consecrated host, is straightforward and clear and all Christians had better stick to it.

The papal Decretals aside, Hoen speaks in his treatise of the *scholastici Romani* in general. His indignant reproach is that their doctrine of transubstantiation implies the sufficiency of a dead, historical faith.[89] He clearly suggests that a doctrine according to which the sacrament is effective *per se* (*ex opere operato*) does not require an active faith in the recipients; he himself is of the opinion that a faith active in true love (according to Gal 5,6) is necessary for the reception not only of the sign but also—and most importantly—of the *res* signified by the signs. His concern, moreover, is with unworthy, that is unbelieving, participants. However his reproach seems out of place as in virtually all scholastic treatises the necessity of spiritual participation is emphasized. Augustine's equation of 'manducare' with 'credere' is present everywhere in medieval theologians' writings on the subject. It is stated in Gratian, in response to the question of what it is to eat Christ's body and to drink his blood, that it does not consist in the mere reception of Christ's body when taking the sacrament, because many partake unworthily. In support, John 6,57 and Augustine's saying *Crede et manducasti* are quoted.[90] To believe in Christ is to eat the living bread; whoever believes in Christ

[89] The concept of historical faith was widely discussed and denounced during the early Reformation in the Low Countries as elsewhere (for example, by Luther in his *De libertate Christiana*). The anonymous author of the *Summa der godliker scrifturen* (1523) contrasted it with true, evangelical faith (J.J. van Toorenenbergen, ed., *Het oudste Nederlandsche verboden boek, 1523. Oeconomica Christiana. Summa der godliker scrifturen* [Leiden, 1882], pp. 151–152). Nicolaus Christi, the confessor of the Béguines at Bergen-op-Zoom, in his sermons used the traditional distinction between *credere Deum* (the belief that God exists), *credere Deo* (the belief that the Bible is the Word of God) and *credere in Deum* (saving faith in God) and threatened his audience, saying that they merely had "een historial gelove" (Fredericq IV, pp. 48–49; see Duke, pp. 50–51). The Zwolle rector Gerardus Listrius defined *fiducia in Christum* as the opposite of *fides historica* (B.J. Spruyt, ed., 'Gerardus Listrius' *Epistola theologica aduersus Dominicanos Suollenses*', NAK 71 [1991] 224–244, at p. 233). Wessel Gansfort discusses the difference between 'credere in Dominum Iesum' and 'credere Dominum Iesum' in the fifty-second chapter of his *De magnitudine passionis*, in Wessel Gansfort, *Opera* (Groningen, 1614), pp. 457–654, at pp. 581–583. See also Gnapheus's *Een troost ende spiegel der siecken*, in BRN I, p. 172, for another instance.

[90] *Decretum Gratiani* III,ii,46–47 (Friedberg I, p. 1331); Augustine, *Tractatus in Euangelium Ioannis*, 25.12 (CCL 36, p. 254.8–9).

eats him. Elsewhere it says that what is taken visibly in the sacrament, is spiritually eaten and drunk.[91]

Several other themes brought up by Hoen had already been discussed in scholastic treatises. Hoen uses the verb 'impanari' to describe the (in his eyes) reprehensible doctrine according to which Christ's body is changed into bread just as Christ became flesh at his incarnation. Remarkably, the eleventh-century opponent of Berengar of Tours, Guitmundus of Aversa, used this same verb to denote (incorrectly) the doctrine of the 'arch-heresiarch' and his followers ('Berengariani'), who believed (as Hoen later did) that the bread remained bread after the consecration.[92] But Alger of Liège used the word in the same sense as Hoen was to use it; he wrote that Christ was not personally changed into bread in the same way in which God had become flesh ("ita personaliter […] impanatus, sicut in carne humana personaliter incarnatus Deus").[93] Wyclif—who was of the opinion that the apostasy of the church had been partly ushered in by Guitmundus's teaching on the Eucharist—used a similar expression to allude to the doctrine according to which the substance of the bread is annihilated after the consecration.[94]

Hoen's interpretation of *Hoc est corpus meum* as *Hoc significat corpus meum*—though it surprised Ulrich Zwingli and supplied him with the clue for his own spiritual interpretation of the Eucharist—was a commonplace as well. It was, for instance, mentioned and refuted by Peter Lombard as well as by Gabriel Biel, who both refer (as does Hoen) to a comparison with the words *petra erat Christus*.[95]

The same holds true for Hoen's comparison of Christ both with the manna the fathers ate in the desert and with the Eucharist. Ambro-

---

[91] *Decretum Gratiani* III,ii,58; see also III, ii,44; III.ii,85; III,iv,1 (Friedberg I, pp. 1336, 1330, 1349–1350, 1361).

[92] Guitmundus of Aversa, *De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate in eucharistia* (MPL 149, 1427–1494), pp. 1430D ("Alii vero […] dicunt ibi [sc. in sacramento—BJS] corpus et sanguinem Domini reuera, sed latenter contineri, et vt sumi possint quodammodo, vt ita dixerim, impanari. Et hanc ipsius Berengarii subtiliorem esse sententiam aiunt") and 1488C ("[…] ipsum ibi corpus Christi esse respondeat [Berengarius], sed impanatum latere"). *Cf.* Jean de Montclos, *Lanfranc et Bérenger: la controverse eucharistique du XIe siècle*. Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense: études et documents, 37 (Louvain, 1971), pp. 7, 200.

[93] Alger of Liège, *De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Dominici* (MPL 180, pp. 743–854), at p. 754B.

[94] John Wyclif, *Tractatus de apostasia*, Michael Henry Dziewicki, ed. (London, 1889) pp. 130, 175; *Trialogus, cum supplemento Trialogi*, Gotthard Lechler, ed. (Oxford, 1869), pp. 269–272.

[95] Lombard IV,10,1; Gabriel Biel, *Canonis missae expositio*, lectio 48G.

sius's judgement was authoritative; this church father had argued that the shadow and image of the manna had now—in New Testament times—been replaced by the light and reality of Christ.[96] His opinion is repeated in Gratian, by Peter Lombard and by Thomas.[97] A dissonant voice was that of Alger of Liège, who argued that the manna as well as the eucharistic bread was a *synical* of Christ's body.[98] Hoen takes a similar position: the manna and the eucharistic bread do not differ qualitatively, for just as the manna signified the living bread to come, so the eucharistic bread signifies the living bread which is Christ. The parallel Hoen draws between the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea and baptism on the one hand, and the manna and the eucharistic bread on the other, is also found in, for example, Lombard, who writes: "Sicut ergo in mari Rubro figura baptismi praecessit, ita in manna significatio Dominici corporis".[99]

---

[96] Ambrose, *De mysteriis* VIII,47–48 (CSEL 73, p. 109).

[97] *Decretum Gratiani* III,ii,69 (Friedberg I, pp. 1339–1340); Lombard IV,viii,2; Thomas, *Summa* III,73,6.

[98] Alger of Liège, MPL 180, p. 762A. See also John H. van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*. Publications of the UCLA Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 18 (Berkeley, 1983), pp. 149, 153, for Rupert's protest against this interpretation.

[99] Lombard IV,viii,2; Thomas, *Summa* III,70,1. If we are to believe the Spanish Franciscan Alfonso de Spina (Espina; d. 1491) in his *Fortalitium fidei in vniuersos Christianae religiones hostes* (ca. 1458–1461), a lengthy treatise on the spiritual weaponry of Christians against their enemies (Jews, Saracens and Christian heretics) which became the methodological and ideological basis of the Spanish Inquisition, Jewish opponents of the Christian faith used similar arguments. One of their objections, according to Spina, against the orthodox understanding of the Eucharist, was its realistic interpretation of Christ's presence on the altar; in their view it was impossible that Christ's real body was in the sacrament, as Christ reasoned 'signatiue et non realiter' when he spoke the words 'hoc est corpus meum': "Dicunt enim Iudei: Vos Christiani dicitis in illo sacramento esse realiter corpus et sanguinem Christi; hoc est impossibile, quia cum dixit vester Christus demonstrato pane: "hoc est corpus meum", significatiue locutus est et non realiter, ac si dixeret: "hoc est signum vel figura corporis mei", secundum quem modum Paulus dixit, ICor. X: "petra autem erat Christus", id est Christi figura. Et patet clarissime quod ista fuerat intentio Christi vestri, quia cum de sui corporis comestione et sanguinis potatione loqueretur vt discipulorum scandalum quod obotum fuerat sopiretur, quasi seipsum exponens dicit: "Verba que locutus sum vobis, spiritus et vita sunt", quasi ea que dixerat non ad literam, sed secundum spiritualem sensum intelligenda essent. Et cum Christus dixit: "Hoc est corpus meum", tenens panem in manibus, intellexit quod ille panis erat corpus suum in potentia propinqua, scilicet postquam comedisset illud, quia tunc conuerteretur in corpus suum, siue in carnem suam; et similiter de vino. Et isto modo nos Iudei facimus illa dei azimorum, quia accipimus panem azimum in memoriam illius temporis quando educti sunt patres nostri de terra Egypti et non sunt permissi ibidem remanere […] Mandauit [Christus] quod fieret ille panis et istud vinum quod erat caro sua et sanguis in potentia propinqua ad exeundum in actu sicut nos Iudei facimus in paschate de azimo pane, sicut dictum est.

Hoen's reference to a mouse eating the eucharistic bread—which implies, he says, that the bread is transitory, which contradicts Ps 15,10—raises difficult questions which were discussed in many scholastic treatises.[100] Finally, the inference from John 16,7 that Christ cannot be corporeally present in the Eucharist (as advanced by Hoen) had been discussed and refuted by Thomas.[101]

All this seems enough to suggest that Hoen revived old heretical arguments which had been discussed and refuted in scholastic treatises such as those cited in this section. Most arguments mentioned here appear upon closer scrutiny to reflect older polemics and discussions which to some extent had dictated the theological agenda. Many of the topics under discussion here ultimately had their origins in the Berengarian and Cathar controversies of the eleventh century onwards.

4. Annulus … mei amoris pignus: *Wessel Gansfort and Hoen's* Epistola[102]

Albert Hardenberg's story of Hoen's discovery of several theological treatises, some of which were by Wessel Gansfort, in the estate of Jacobus Hoeck, dean of Naaldwijk, has led many historians to consider

---

Cum ergo Christus vester accepit panem et calicem et dedit discipulis suis, non mandauit eis credere panem et vinum in corpus et sanguinem suum transmutari, sed quod quotienscumque quod hoc facerent in memoriam suam facerent, siue in memoriam illius panis preteriti": Alfonso of Spina, *Fortalitium fidei in vniuersos Christiane religionis hostes*, Guilelmus Totani, ed. (Lyon, 1525; Oxford, Bodley: 8o F 12Th), clxxi–clxxii. On Spina, see Isidore Loeb, 'La controverse religieuse entre les chrétiens et les juifs au Moyen Age en France et en Espagne', *Revue de l'histoire des religions* IX–17 (1888) 311–337 and IX–18 (1888) 133–156, at pp. 152–153; Mario Esposito, 'Une secte d'hérétiques à Medina del Campo en 1459, d'après le *Fortalicum fidei* d'Alphonse de Spina', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 32 (1936) 350–360; Mario Esposito, 'Notes sur le *Fortalicum fidei* d'Alphonse de Spina', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 43 (1948) 514–536; Van Balberghe and Gilmont, 'Les théologiens et la "Vauderie" au XVe siècle', p. 400 (note 40).

[100] *E.g.* Lombard IV,13,1 and Thomas, *Summa* III,80,3. This argument will be discussed in more detail *infra*, pp. 132, 139–140, 146, 148.

[101] Thomas, *Summa* III,75,1 (4). There is also, however, a remarkable parallel between Hoen's treatise and Thomas's *Summa*. Hoen remarked that an unworthy participant shows that Christ is present with him by his eating and drinking, while by his unbelief he separates himself from Christ; Thomas (*Summa* III,80,4) wrote that every believer forms part of Christ's mystical body and that every unworthy and unbelieving partaker of the sacrament separates himself from this body and becomes a *sacramenti violator*.

[102] This section is by and large a repetition, with some slight modifications (omissions

Wessel Gansfort's writings as one of Hoen's sources.[103] However, it is striking that in Hardenberg's extensive discussion of Hoen and of Wessel's treatises,[104] Hoen is nowhere mentioned as the author of a treatise on the Eucharist. The *vetus scriptum de coena* discussed was either one of Wessel's writings or, what seemed more likely to Hardenberg, a more than two-hundred-year-old treatise which had been *found* by Hoen and others. The *Vita Wesseli* gives no reason to assume a link between Wessel and Hoen or to think of Hoen as the executor of the inheritance of Wessel's writings. Nevertheless, there are some facts which *suggest* a relationship, making a new investigation desirable and necessary.

During his journey through the several centres of the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland,[105] Hinne Rode showed Wessel's writings to Johannes Oecolampadius. He made clear to Bucer that he was a pupil of Wessel's. In addition, Rode delivered Hoen's treatise to Zwingli and he must be held responsible for the publication of Wessel's writings by Simon Corver in Zwolle. Since Hoen himself must have handed his treatise over to Rode and since Rode had both Hoen's *Epistola* and Wessel's writings with him during his journey, it might be supposed that Rode obtained (a part of) Wessel's writings via Hoen and that Hoen therefore owned writings by Wessel. It is, however, impossible to ascertain which of Wessel's writings Hoen may have seen; some of Wessel's writings which Rode took with him on his journey came from the famous convent of the Canons Regular of Mount St Agnes. Hardenberg reveals this fact, and this information can be trusted, because Wessel visited the convent regularly. If, therefore, we want to investigate the relationship between Wessel's ideas and those of Hoen, it will be necessary to assume that Hoen had all Wessel's writings at his disposal and to search for passages in Wessel's *Opera* which have

---

and additions), of my article 'Wessel Gansfort and Cornelis Hoen's *Epistola Christiana*: "The ring as a pledge of my love"', in F. Akkerman, Gerda C. Huisman and A.J. Vanderjagt, edd., *Wessel Gansfort and Northern Humanism*. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 40 (Leiden, 1993), pp. 122–141. This article was presented as a paper in the summer of 1989 and in the meantime I have revised my conclusion.

[103] On Wessel Gansfort, see the volume cited in note 102; see also Jaap van Moolenbroek, 'The Correspondence of Wessel Gansfort: An Inventory', NAKG 84 (2004) 95–125.

[104] Albert Hardenberg, 'Vita Wesseli Groningensis', in Wessel Gansfort, *Opera*, fol. **–***2v, at fol. **6v–7v; summarized and discussed *supra*, chapter I,1.

[105] This journey is discussed in detail *infra*, chapter IV, 2.

left their traces in Hoen's *Epistola*. It is only reasonable to look for these themes first in Wessel's *De sacramento eucharistiae et audienda missa*.

The first thing that stands out is the difference in form and tone of the treatises by Wessel and Hoen. Wessel's *De sacramento* is first of all a devotional treatise; it has a mystical ardour and reveals the 'familiarity with sacred things' which Johan Huizinga thought typical of late medieval devotional life.[106] Wessel's argumentation is unsystematic; there is almost no internal coherence and in fact the treatise is a series of edifying effusions. Hoen's *Epistola*, on the other hand, is an intellectual and rational, even scholastic argument (as the preceding section revealed). Besides this relevant stylistic difference, the points of view are widely divergent: Hoen attacked the doctrine of transubstantiation, while Wessel confirmed it (though he does not use the term). In chapter XXIII of *De sacramento*, for example, Wessel writes that the confidence of the faithful in the sacrament of the Eucharist should be great:

> Is enim ipse adest qui, dum in Iudaea, Galilea, Samaria, clamores et orationes omnium exaudivit, petentium lachrymas miseratus, desideria explevit, quin etiam ultro, non vocatus, saepe miseratus miseros consolabatur. Datus ergo ad hoc in sacramento altaris per officium sacerdotalis ordinis.[107]

When Christians receive the sacrament, they must piously believe, according to Wessel, that Christ is corporeally ('corporaliter') present, in the same way that he is sacramentally ('sacramentaliter') present in several places.[108] For this reason the bread of the Eucharist lives and vivifies, full of omnipotent strength; under the visible elements of bread and wine the sacred flesh and blood of Christ are truly present.[109]

---

[106] J. Huizinga, *Herfsttij der middeleeuwen: studie over levens- en gedachtenvormen der veertiende en vijftiende eeuw in Frankrijk en de Nederlanden* (1919), in Huizinga, *Verzamelde werken* III (Haarlem, 1949), pp. 3–435, at pp. 186–187. See J. Huizinga, *The Waning of the Middle Ages*, translated by F. Hopman (New York, 1924), pp. 140–141.

[107] Wessel Gansfort, *De sacramento eucharistiae et audienda missa*, in Wessel Gansfort, *Opera* (Groningen, 1614), pp. 655–708, at pp. 695–696.

[108] *Opera*, p. 700: "Et pie credendum est […] adesse Dominum Iesum et corporaliter […] Et non est inconveniens […] si sacramentaliter est in pluribus locis."

[109] *Opera*, p. 690: "Sacramentum Eucharistiae panis est vitae vivus et vivificus, plenus omnipotentis virtutis"; *Opera*, p. 673: "Quisquis enim credit fide non ficta omnipotentiae Dei, sub speciebus pani et vini veraciter sanctam illam carnem, sanctum illum sanguinem potentissima dignatione, dignantissima beneficentia, benefictissimo fructu praesentialiter contineri, nonnihil spiritualis vitae experitur in se."

In addition to this realist line of thought, there is in Wessel's remarks on the Eucharist a current which Maarten van Rhijn called 'spiritualistic'.[110] Wessel emphasizes the importance of 'manducatio spiritualis'. He argues that it is not sufficient to partake only 'corporaliter' and 'sensibiliter', but that the body and blood of Christ ought also to be eaten 'spiritualiter':

> Corpus autem et sanguis Domini Iesu, quantumlibet sancta sint, corpora tamen sunt, non spiritus. Vnde si corporaliter tantum sumantur, non solum non spiritualiter reficient manducantem, sed occident.[111]

This 'manducatio spiritualis' is an act of faith and is achieved through 'commemoratio': 'Manducare igitur memorari'.[112] He who eats 'spiritualiter' already has the fruits of outward sacramental eating. He who belives in Christ eats his flesh; Christ said that both he who eats his flesh and he who believes in him has eternal life (John 6,54 and 3,36), so that he who believes in Christ eats his body.[113] By faith in Christ his flesh is eaten and his blood is drunk.[114] The inner man is spiritual; for this reason the bread must be spiritual and must be eaten spiritually.[115]

Thus far, Wessel shows no marked departure from received opinion on the Eucharist. But now he goes a step further to argue that Christ, independent of the sacrament of the altar, can be 'corporeally' present to those who long for him.[116] For this reason the 'commemoratio' has a central, constitutive significance:

> I say that to one who remembers his name, the Lord Jesus is truly present, not only in his deity, but also in his flesh and entire humanity. For who can doubt, that the Lord Jesus is often bodily present with his

---

[110] M. van Rhijn, *Wessel Gansfort* (The Hague, 1917), pp. 213–215.

[111] *Opera*, p. 673.

[112] *Opera*, p. 677.

[113] *Opera*, p. 696: "Si enim nemo vitam habet, qui non carnem eius manducat et non bibit sanguinem eius; et credens in eum habet vitam aeternam, oportebit necessario confiteri omnem credentem manducare carnem eius et bibere eius sanguinem." S. Voolstra, *Het Woord is vlees geworden: de melchioritisch-menniste incarnatieleer* (Kampen, 1982), p. 91, incorrectly writes that this combination of Io 6,54 and Io 3,36 also occurs in Hoen's *Epistola*.

[114] *Opera*, p. 702: "*Et qui vivit et credit in me, non morietur in aeternum*. Ergo credendo in eum comeditur et manducatur caro eius, et bibitur sanguis eius."

[115] *Opera*, p. 673: "Sicut ergo interior homo spiritus est et etiam vita spiritualis: ita panem hunc spiritualem esse oportet et spiritualiter manducare. Nisi enim panem hunc manducaverimus, non habemus vitam in nobis."

[116] *Opera*, p. 695: "etiam corporaliter cominus esse voluit desiderantibus."

> faithful disciples in their agonies?—though he does not therefore forsake his seat at the right hand of God in heaven. Who can doubt that this may occur simultaneously outside the Eucharist as well as in it?[117]

Accordingly, sacramental eating is of significance but of less value than spiritual eating: sacramental eating without spiritual eating is infertile, even unto death, because it is in violation of Jesus's command to take the bread and the wine 'to his remembrance'.[118] Spiritual eating, on the other hand, is always fertile and life-giving, more fertile than sacramental eating.[119] To eat truly is to eat spiritually by believing and remembering what Jesus gave us and what he suffered for us.[120]

Two aspects can thus be discerned in Wessel's doctrine of the Eucharist, a realist one and a 'spiritualistic' one. Emphasizing the realist line, some scholars have made a distinction between Wessel's ideas and Hoen's. Van Rhijn, for example, wrote that it is incorrect to call Wessel one of the spiritual fathers of the 'sacramentarians' of the sixteenth century and that Wessel's contemplations 'do not at all correspond to those of Erasmus, Hoen or Zwingli'.[121] At the same time, however, some historians believed they had found in the second 'spiritualistic' aspect the point of contact and the line of communication between Wessel and Hoen. Hoen was thus alleged to have subscribed to Wessel's spiritualistic interpretation of the Eucharist and to have radicalized it.[122] Some concerns might, however, be raised here.

In the first place, spiritualistic contemplations of the Eucharist are so little particular to Wessel that it is somewhat far-fetched to construct a

---

[117] *Opera*, p. 697. See also *Opera*, p. 696: "Datur et pietati fidelium etiam corporaliter praesens, extra Eucharistiam et absque speciebus panis et vini, quando datur credentibus in eum."

[118] See especially *Opera*, pp. 658–659.

[119] *Opera*, pp. 147–149.

[120] *Opera*, pp. 703–704; see also *Opera*, p. 141: "Qui enim credit iam manducat. Sed vt quotidie manducet panem et sit ei panis quotidianus, crebro oportet commemoret […] Nemo enim tam frigidus charitate, tam devius veritate, quin pie possit, cum velit, commemorare quae Dominus Iesus pertulit, docuit, donavit, quae praecepit, promisit."

[121] M. van Rhijn, 'De invloed van Wessel Gansfort', in Van Rhijn, *Studiën over Wessel Gansfort en zijn tijd* (Utrecht, 1933), pp. 38–73, at p. 41.

[122] See (from among numerous examples that could be quoted here) George H. Williams, *The Radical Reformation*, p. 107: "Hoen found some of Gansfort's manuscripts, among them […] *De sacramento eucharistiae*. Hoen was fascinated by it and immediately shared the ideas with Dorp and their friends. Thereupon he proceeded to form his own more radical view of the Lord's Supper"; Heiko A. Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation: the shape of late medieval thought illustrated by key documents* (New York, 1966), p. 253: "Wessel's eucharistic theology, radically interpreted by Hoen".

dependence by Hoen on Wessel on the basis of the latter's 'spiritualism'. The 'manducatio spiritualis' is a traditional scholastic distinction, found in both the old and modern doctors.[123] Moreover, in the late Middle Ages many pious believers did not partake of but only beheld the consecrated host so as not to be found unworthy before the judging Christ.[124] This *timor Dei* is found especially in the circles of the Devotio Moderna. Petrus Horn, for example, in his *Vita Gerardi Magni*, narrates that Geert Grote often did not commune:

> Denique sic se cotidie sub missa preparabat, quasi in sumendo osculum pacis sumeret corpus salvatoris, quatenus saepe eum spiritualiter manducaret quem sacramentaliter sumere frequentius formidabat.[125]

Another relevant example of this phenomenon is a text by Peter of Dieburg, rector and chronicler of the House of the Brothers at Hildesheim, written on the occasion of an interdict, when regular sacramental ministrations had to be suspended. Responding to the anxieties this suspension of regular divine services provoked among the brothers, Peter wrote that

> the effect of a sacrament comes from its contents and is not only caused by the external thing containing that effect; this contained essence, moreover, is perceived only by a pure and focused mind. When both (the external solemnity and interior mystery) cannot be had, it is better, all other things being equal, to be distant from the church or the sacrament in body rather than in mind.[126]

---

[123] See Heiko A. Oberman, 'The "Extra" Dimension in the Theology of Calvin', in Oberman, *The Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Medieval and Early Reformation Thought* (Edinburgh, 1986), pp. 234–258, at p. 243.

[124] See, *e.g.*, M. van Rhijn, 'De dogmenhistorische achtergrond van Wessel Gansfort's Avondmaalsleer', in Van Rhijn, *Studiën over Wessel Gansfort en zijn tijd*, pp. 74–90, at pp. 86–89; Joachim Staedtke, 'Voraussetzungen der Schweizer Abendmahlslehre', *Theologische Zeitschrift* 16 (1960) 19–32, at pp. 27–31. For the anxieties of the young Luther in celebrating Mass, see Martin Brecht, *Martin Luther* I: *Sein Weg zur Reformation, 1483–1521* (Stuttgart, 1986), pp. 77–82.

[125] Petrus Horn, *Vita Gerardi Magni*, W.J. Kühler, ed., NAK 6 (1909) 325–370, at p. 359. See also Heiko A. Oberman, '*Die Gelehrten die Verkehrten*: Popular Response to Learned Culture in the Renaissance and Reformation', in Steven Ozment, ed., *Religion and Culture in the Renaissance and the Reformation* (Kirksville, 1989), pp. 43–63, at pp. 52–53 (note 32) and see my 'Wessel Gansfort and Cornelis Hoen's *Epistola Christiana*: "The ring as a pledge of my love", p. 135, note 74.

[126] See Richard Doebner, ed., *Annalen und Akten der Brüder des gemeinsamen Lebens im Lüchtenhofe zu Hildesheim* (Hannover–Leipzig, 1903), pp. 144–150, at p. 145. For an English translation of the text (from which the passage quoted is taken), see John H. van Engen, *Devotio Moderna: Basic writings* (New York, 1988), pp. 235–241.

Additionally, the denial of transubstantiation and *praesentia realis* was widespread in the Low Countries during the entire fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, and spiritualistic notions were expressed time and again.[127] This much is clear, then, that a spiritualistic interpretation of the Eucharist—which may also, in a specific form, be imputed to Wessel—was so generally diffused on the eve of the Reformation that it is impossible on this tenuous basis to draw a line of influence from Wessel to Hoen.

Moreover, Wessel's and Hoen's spiritualism must be distinguished. Wessel argues that the 'commemoratio' causes the bodily *presence* of Christ with the faithful; Hoen states that 'commemoratio' implies the bodily *absence* of him who is commemorated.[128] Wessel's contemplations lead away from taking part in the Mass as his ideas render reception of the sacrament virtually superfluous. While Petrus Horn's remarks on the communion practice of Geert Grote *suggest* the sufficiency of spiritual participation, Wessel developed a doctrine of this sufficiency which reduced the value of the outward use of the elements of the Eucharist and almost denied their worth. Hoen, however, did not impugn outward participation; what he wanted was a different way or mode of participation. In Hoen's opinion, the sacrament of the Eucharist was the pledge of the forgiveness of sins and hence of great value. His criticism was launched against transubstantiation as well as against the doctrine of the sufficiency of a dead, historical faith. This criticism did not tone down or underrate the value of the sacrament.

Another theme in Wessel's writings, however, recurs in Hoen's *Epistola*, namely the image of the ring. According to Wessel, during the Eucharist God contracts a marriage with the souls of the faithful and leaves behind a pledge of his love ('amoris pignus'); the souls of the faithful contract this marriage by 'commemoratio'.[129] In the *Scala meditationis* Wessel calls the calyx a pledge ('pignus') of the inheritance which will one day be possessed.[130] In other places he connects these state-

[127] See *infra* chapter III, 6, D.

[128] *Opera*, pp. 695, 697; Ep. 228.17–21.

[129] *Opera*, p. 668: "Nimirum ergo, si sua nobilitate meditatio nostra verbum aeternae sapientiae superbis ac altissimis nuptiis ambiat, et has nuptias mens nostra commemoratione contrahit […] hanc artem [sc. ars commemorationis] tantum voluit docere [Christus], quantum charissimum amoris pignus curavit relinquere."

[130] *Opera*, p. 380: "O me felicem, si calicis huius praeclaram claritatem contempler et crebro visitem, crebro degustem! Hoc mihi signum adoptionis meae, hoc mihi pignus

ments about Christ's pledge with the image of the ring. He regards God's promise as reliable, as a ring which one receives from a king.[131] Later in this same text Wessel prays

> In this exercise let me serve you, until I am betrothed to you, the blood-bridegroom, in faithful love, as through a ring, in a lasting bond of marriage.[132]

Elsewhere in *De magnitudine passionis* Wessel, treating the spiritual 'communio' by 'commemoratio', explains the love between Christ and the faithful by means of a parable about the love between a king's daughter and a farmer's son. The king's daughter tries to win the farmer's son by sending him gifts, without, however, making herself known to him. The farmer's son does not know to whom he owes these benefits and becomes distressed and impatient. After some time he begins to suspect that these gifts come from the king's daughter and he expresses his wish to speak to her in private. This is not allowed, but the king's daughter lets him know from behind a wall that one day he will not only see her but also embrace and kiss her. Till then she gives him a security ('arrha'): a precious ring which she describes as a pledge of her love ('amoris pignus'). With this gift she dispels his confusion and uncertainty.[133] In a letter to the nun Gertrude Reyniers, Wessel also describes the love of Jesus in terms of a wedding ring, an 'annulus nuptialis'.[134]

Though Wessel, like Hoen, used the image of the ring in connection with the Eucharist, and though this symbol is in fact the only theme in Wessel's *Opera* that is specifically found again in Hoen's treatise, any effort to ascertain on this basis that Wessel inspired Hoen remains precarious. The alleged connection is tenuous when it is considered that the use of the ring symbol in connection with the Eucharist was not without precedent. Though it does not seem to have been widespread, Bernard had used it in a well-known sermon and it occurs

---

et fidum pignus quandoque possidendae hereditatis."

[131] *Opera*, p. 359: "De hac mihi divinitus pollicitatione reposita, velut annulo regis fiducialiter accingor."

[132] *Opera*, p. 383: "in hac exercitatione mea fac militare tibi, doned tibi sponso sanguinis fideli amore, tanquam annulo, stabili nuptiarum connubio desponser."

[133] *Opera*, pp. 602–603. See p. 603: "arrham hanc ex digito meo, annulum meum nobilissimo et ditissimo carbunculo flagrantem, mei amoris pignus habeto."

[134] *Opera*, p. 917: "Amor Iesu annulus est nuptialis, quo sine thalamo indigna censebitur omnis desponsata." See also *Opera*, p. 687: "Amoris enim convivium erit, ad quod nemo dignus, nisi qui nuptiali veste parilem refert amorem."

in a fourteenth-century Latin sermon from England.[135] In addition, in Wessel's writings, God's promises and the pledge given by him relate to a future unity of love, to which one climbs up by a mystical *scala*; to Wessel the pledge was 'pignus futurae gloriae'.[136] For Hoen, on the other hand, promise and pledge relate to the forgiveness of sins in the present. In other words, the image of the ring was filled by Hoen with ideas of the forgiveness of sins which he derived from another source. In the next section of this chapter this source will be determined; the present section must end with the conclusion that Hoen, assuming he knew Wessel's treatises at all, derived from them the symbol of the ring, while assigning a radically different meaning to it. More probably, there is no relation whatsoever between Wessel's ideas and Hoen's.

5. *The Eucharist as* pignus remissionis peccatorum: *the influence of Martin Luther*

Hoen's treatise contains an embedded, hidden reference to a tract by Luther. At the beginning, he introduces an antagonist who objects that the word of God clearly states that the eucharistic bread is the body of Christ: *Hoc est corpus meum*. Hoen admits this to be true, but counters that the words *Quodcumque ligaueris…* (Mt 16,19) can be found in the Bible as well and that the scholastics use this text to defend the tyranny of Rome, while an examination of the text has shown that these words do not support this interpretation:

> sed illud [verbum] diligentius excussum, inuentum est nihil pro tyrannide facere.[137]

Hoen's choice of words—*tyrannis Romana*—unveils the examiner. In his treatise on the Babylonian captivity of the church (August – October 1520) Luther, in the chapter on the sacrament of penance, had produced several arguments against the appeal to this text in support of what he called papal tyranny. Instead of explaining Christ's promises contained in these words (and in Mt 16,18 and John 20,23) and the faith they required from Christians, the priests derived from them the imple-

[135] See *supra*, note 15.

[136] *Opera*, p. 676: "Nihil enim ita reficit, nutrit, roborat, exhilarat, laetificat, satiat amantem, vt indulta prima amatoris, quae interim per fidem in Eucharistia, demum per speciem et facie ad faciem videbimus."

[137] Ep. 227.10–12.

ments of their impious tyranny, *i.e.*, their worldly and celestial power to rule tyrannically over the souls entrusted to their care.[138]

In this chapter Luther had already drawn a parallel with the sacrament of the Eucharist and the words of institution. These words, he said, were also spoken to stimulate faith on the part of the partakers: through them they should be confident that they would receive the remission of sins.[139] In his treatment of the Mass, Luther argued that it was a 'testamentum' which contained the 'promissio remissionis peccatorum, a Deo nobis facta'; in the recipients it required only faith, neither works nor any merits.[140] Paraphrazing Christ's words, Luther wrote:

> his verbis promitto tibi, ante omnium meritum et votum tuum, remissionem omnium peccatorum tuum et vitam aeternam. Et vt certissimus de hac mea promissione irreuocabili sis, corpus meum tradam et sanguinem fundam, morte ipsa hanc promissionem confirmaturus et vtrunque tibi in signum et memoriale eiusdem prommissionis relicturus.[141]

A year earlier, Luther had written in the same way about the Mass in *Ein Sermon von dem Neuen Testament, das ist von der heiligen Messe* (August 1519). He explained the Mass as "ein gelubd" and "testament" and in answer to the question "Was ist den nu diss testament oder was wirt uns drynnen bescheyden von Christo?" Luther wrote that the remission of sins was its content:

> als solt er [Christus] sagen, "Sihe da mensch, ich sag dir zu und bescheyde dir mit dissen worten vorgebung aller deyner sund und das ewig leben. Und das du gewiss seyest und wissest das solch gelubd dir unwidderrufflich bleyb, sso wil ich drauf sterben und meyn leyb und blut

[138] StA II, pp. (168)172–259, at pp. 227–228 (= WA VI, [484]497–573, at pp. 543–544). In his annotation on John 20,23 (in all editions) Erasmus likewise had written that the words 'Quorum remiseritis peccata, etc.' should not be misused to derive from them tyrannical power: "Qui ex his posterioribus cristas erigunt, et tyrannidem quandam sibi vindicant, cur non meminerunt eorum quae mox praecesserunt [sc.: 'Dixit ergo eis iterum, "pax vobis"']? Omnia plena dissidiis, litibus, bellis. Toti turgemus mundano spiritu, et tamen placemus nobis autoritate commissa remittendi aut retinendi peccata." As Hoen, however, explicitly refers to Mt 16,19, while on other grounds his knowledge of Luther's tract is established as well (see *infra*), this annotation is most probably not his source here (though he may have known it, of course).

[139] StA II, p. 228.31–34: "Ita cum dicit, 'Accipite, hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis tradetur; Hic est calix in sanguine meo' etc., fidem prouocat manducantium, vt his verbis per fidem firmata conscientia certi sint sese remissionem peccatorum accipere, si manducauerint" (= WA VI, p. 544).

[140] StA II, p. 196 (= WA VI, pp. 513–514).

[141] StA II, p. 196.20–24 (= WA VI, p. 515).

> dafur geben, und beydes dir zum zeychen und sigell hinder mir lassen da bey du meyn gedencken solt", wie er sagt, "sso offt yhr das thut, sso gedenckt an mich".[142]

These remarks by Luther rightly led August-Wilhelm Dieckhoff to decide that Luther's ideas were the inspiration for Hoen's positive assessment of the Eucharist at the beginning of his *Epistola*. Dieckhoff was followed by E.L. Enders and by J. Trapman. Enders wrote

> Der Anfang des Briefs mit seiner Definition des Sacraments als *promissio remissionis peccatorum* und als *pignus* weist bestimmt auf Luthers Lehre vom Sacrament hin, welche er zum ersten Mal in seinem, August 1520 [sic!] erschienenen Sermon vom Neuen Testament […] ausgeführt hatte, welchen Hoen gelesen haben muss, ehe er an seine Darstellung ging.[143]

Trapman expressed his approval, writing that Hoen's combination of promise, remission, pledge and faith at the beginning of his treatise had been rightly regarded as an indication of Luther's influence. He also added that Hoen differed from Luther in that he did not concentrate his attack on the Mass as a sacrifice, which for Luther was essential.[144] These observations by Trapman, correct as they are, require one slight modification: as Hoen has been shown to have read *De captiuitate Babylonica*, the latter treatise rather than *Ein Sermon von dem Neuen Testament* must have been the actual source of his positive assessment of the Eucharist, the more so since *Ein Sermon* was only published in the vernacular and had no Latin translation.

The last part of the *Epistola* seems to refer to another of Luther's ideas on the Eucharist, this time, however, negatively. The text states that no credence should be given to those who claim that Christ's body is in the eucharistic bread in the same way as fire pervades iron (*sicut ignis in ferro*).[145] As is well-known, Luther used this image to clarify his doctrine of consubstantiation; in *De captiuitate Babylonica*, for example, he wrote

---

[142] StA I, (288)289–311, at p. 293.21–26 (= WA VI, [349]353–378, at p. 358).

[143] *Dr. Martin Luther's Briefwechsel*, Ernst Ludwig Enders, ed., III (Calw–Stuttgart, 1889), p. 424.

[144] Trapman, *De Summa der godliker scrifturen (1523)*, p. 116. The only reformed text from the Netherlands which repeats Luther's protest against the Mass as a re-enactment of the unique sacrifice of Christ is, to my knowledge, Gerardus Listrius's open letter against the Zwolle Black Friars; see Spruyt, ed., 'Gerardus Listrius' *Epistola theologica aduersus Dominicanos Suollenses*', pp. 238–239.

[145] Ep. 233.27–29: "Neque audiendos puto, qui dicunt corpus Christi esse in pane sicut ignis in ferro, nisi non audiamus Christum dicentem: 'Si dixerint: in penetralibus est Christus, nolite credere'."

> Cur autem non possit Christus corpus suum intra substantiam panis continere sicut in accidentibus? Ecce ignis et ferrum duae substantiae, sic miscentur in ferro ignito vt quaelibet pars sit ferrum et ignis. Cur non multo magis corpus gloriosum Christi sic in omni parte substantiae panis esse possit?[146]

In his critical edition of this text, Rudolf Mau in his commentary[147] gave a parallel passage from Origen's *De principiis* (2,6,6)[148] and one from the commentary on Luke by Cyril of Alexandria (412–444). While Origen, however, applied the text to clarify his trinitarian ideas, Cyril used it in connection with the Eucharist. The passage from his commentary on Lc 22,19 reads

> Cum igni ferrum admoueris, tunc illius vi repletur, et cum sit suapte natura ferrum, nihilominus ignis vim continet. Itaque vivificum Dei Verbum cum se propriae copulauit carni, eo quem scit ipse modo, vivificam illam efficit.[149]

Likewise, John Damascene (born 675), the apogee of Greek patristics and staunch defender of the veneration of icons, developed the idea of *perichorese*, the reciprocal penetration of the godly and human nature in the person of Christ. In accordance with this notion, John Damascene taught the unification of Christ's body and the eucharistic bread, comparing it with coal in which wood and fire are most intimately united:

> diuinum carbonem sumamus vt desiderii nostri ignis, accepto carbonis ardore, peccata nostra comburat et corda illuminet, diuinique adeo ignis commercio inardescamus et in deos evadamus. Carbonem vidit Isaias [6,2]: carbo non est simplex lignum, sed igni unitum; sic quoque panis communionis non simplex est panis, sed divinitati coniunctum est; non una natura est, sed una quidem est corporis, altera coniunctae cum ipso diuinitatis. Quo fit vt vtrumque non sit una natura, sed duae.[150]

John Wyclif was well aware of this concept, referring to it in his *Tractatus de apostasia* (1380) to expound his doctrine of 'consubstantiation'.[151] Hence Luther's use of this image to explain his eucharistic notions is

---

[146] StA II, p. 189.9–12 (= WA VI, p. 510). For other places where Luther uses this image (also in connection with the unification of Christ and the soul of the faithful), see StA II, p. 189, note 111.

[147] StA II, p. 189, note 111.

[148] MPG 11, p. 213.

[149] Cyrillus Alexandrinus, *Explanatio in Lucae Euangelium* (MPG 72, pp. 475–950), pp. 909–910.

[150] Ioannes Damascenus, *Expositio accurata fidei orthodoxae* (MPG 94, pp. 790–1228), p. 1150A–B.

[151] John Wyclif, *Tractatus de apostasia*, pp. 51–52.

not unique, and for this reason the passage of the *Epistola* under discussion here is not necessarily directed against Luther.

This may, on the contrary, be the case when on the final page of the *Epistola* the critical question is asked why the person addressed there considers himself free to do and say what Christ has not expressly forbidden: as is well-known, Luther used this argument as an important reason to oppose the radical innovations introduced in Wittenberg in 1521/1522.[152]

6. Secundo l'opinione di Vichleff et di Berengario: *Wyclif, Hus and (late) medieval dissent*

Thus far, it has been possible to partially unveil the historical background of Hoen's arguments. Nevertheless, the references provided so far remain unsatisfactory. They do not enable us to better understand Hoen's departures, nor the premises he passes over in silence. Hoen's central argument was based on Mt 24,23 (and its equivalent, Mk 13,21) which runs through his treatise as a refrain.[153] In that text Christ tells his disciples not to believe those who say, "Christ is here, or Christ is there". While Augustine (and medieval theologians including Wyclif) had used this text to demonstrate that Catholic truth was universal, and Luther and Erasmus used it to criticize the pretensions of the religious orders, Hoen applied the text to the Eucharist.[154] The text, as the

---

[152] See James S. Preus, *Carlstadt's* Ordinaciones *and Luther's liberty: a study of the Wittenberg movement, 1521–1522*. Harvard Theological Studies, 26 (Cambridge, Mass., 1974).

[153] Ep. 227.15–16; 227.34–35; 231.24–26; 233.24; 233.27–29. See J.G. de Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland* (Amsterdam, 1873), p. 98, and Trapman, *De Summa der godliker scrifturen (1523)*, p. 116.

[154] In *De corpore et sanguine Domini aduersus Berengarium Turonensem liber* (MPL 150, pp. 407–442, at p. 442), Lanfranc, quoting Augustine, refers to Mt 24,23 to refute with this indication of the universality of the church Berengarius's alleged claim that the church only continued to exist in the sect of his adherents. See also Jean de Montclos, *Lanfranc et Bérenger*, p. 323. The *Glossa ordinaria* at this place remarks: "Habet vna quaecunque haeresis vel certas mundi partes, vnde dicitur: 'hic vel illic', vel in occultis aut in obscuris conuenticulis curiositatem hominum decipit, vnde dicitur: 'Ecce, in cubilibo, ecce in deserto' […] Nolite credere quod Christus in deserto vel in penetralibus, sed quod fides eius ab oriente in occidentem in Catholicis fulget clara et manifesta. Ne ergo credatur schismaticis. Nomine orientis et occidentis totum orbem designat" (*Biblia latina cum glossa ordinaria* [Strasbourg: Adolph Rusch, 1480–1481; repr. in four volumes, Turnhout, 1982], vol. IV, *ad locum*). John Wyclif used this place against papal schism; see, a.o., *Exposicio textus Matthei XXIV* (1382/1383) in *Opera minora*, Johann Loserth, ed. (London, 1913), pp. 354–382, at pp. 366–369. In spite of August Neander's assertion

latter read it, explained that Christ was not tied to any specific place and thus was not *in* the bread of the Eucharist. Furthermore, Hoen believed that the text contained a warning against the dangers of his own time.

Equally rare is the periodization Hoen develops in his treatise, which is closely tied to his use of Mt 24,23. Hoen points out that the dogma of transubstantiation does not occur in the Apostolic Confession and was not established until 1215 under Innocent III. He categorizes it as a papal invention but prefers to call it a "diabolical invention". Since that time, the entire papal religion has been based on this dogma of the devil, who wants to ruin everything by convincing people of Christ's bodily presence in the Eucharist, although Christ, on the contrary, told his disciples that the absence of his body was to their benefit.[155] Within this context Hoen presents his arguments against the dogma of transubstantiation. A search for the sources of these premises and principles leads in the first place to a number of writings by the late medieval heretics John Wyclif and Jan Hus, in particular Wyclif's late treatises *De apostasia* and *De eucharistia* (both from 1380) and his theological *summa*, the *Trialogus* (1382/1383), as well as the theological *quaestio*, *De sanguine Christi*, by Hus.[156]

---

that Matthias of Janov also applied Mt 24,23 to those "welche sagten: 'Hier oder dort ist das Blut Christi'" (*Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche* VI [Hamburg, 1852], p. 456), it becomes clear from Janov's *Regulae veteris et noui testamenti* (Vlastimil Kybal, ed., 4 books in 5 vols. (Innsbruck–Prague, 1908–1926) that he, too, applied the text to the unfortunate division within Christendom. For Luther, who protested against Andreas Karlstadt's appeal to this text (in which he was to be followed by Ioannes Oecolampadius and Martin Bucer), see WA VIII, p. 657.16–38; WA XVIII, p. 211.6–12; WA XXVI, pp. 423.37–424.23.

[155] Ep. 231.27 – 233.12.

[156] John Wyclif, *De apostasia*; John Wyclif, *De eucharistia tractatus maior. Accedit tractatus de eucharistia et poenitentia siue de confessione*, Johann Loserth, ed. (London, 1892); John Wyclif, *Trialogus cum supplemento Trialogi*, Gotthardus Lechler, ed. (Oxford, 1869). The *editio princeps* of Wyclif's *Trialogus* appeared in 1525 under the title *Io[annis] VVicleff […] dialogorum libri quattuor*; it was printed by Peter Schöffer in Worms. See Jozef Benzing, 'Peter Schöffer d.J. zu Worms und seine Drucke (1518–1529)', *Der Wormsgau* 5 (1961–1962) 108–118, at p. 111, and Michael A. Pegg, *A Catalogue of German Reformation Pamphlets (1516–1550) in Swiss Libraries*. Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana, 99 (Baden-Baden, 1983), no. 5279. The University Library of Utrecht holds a copy of this edition (Rariora F 123). For bibliographical information about Wyclif's writings, see Williel R. Thomson, *The Latin Writings of John Wyclif*. Subsidia mediaevalia, 14 (Toronto, 1983). Joannis Hus, *De sanguine Christi*, Wenzel Flajshans, ed. *Opera omnia* I/3 (Prague, s.a.).

A. *John Wyclif (ca. 1330–1384)*[157]

After approximately 1365, Wyclif developed the theme of double substances or quiddities. In several treatises he propounded the theory that opposing entities (such as God and man, the universal and the accidental, the divine and the natural, Scripture and tradition, faith and reason, and the *corpus Christi* and the eucharistic bread) can be combined while each substance nevertheless retains its fundamental independence, integrity and identity. Conversion from one substance into another is possible, but the reality of the converted substance, for example that of the eucharistic bread, is not thereby destroyed or annihilated. After consecration the eucharistic bread remains a combination of two quiddities: "The sacrament of the altar is the true body of Christ *and* [at the same time] true bread, just as Christ is truly God and [at the same time] truly man."[158] While both combined entities retain their independence, they act as one; Wyclif frequently therefore calls the eucharistic bread an effective sign (*signum efficax*).[159]

With the aid of these philosophical principles Wyclif judged the prevailing opinions of his day. His polemics were directed against theological and ecclesiastical developments that had been initiated by Innocent III (1198–1216) and which had led to a replacement of the natural by the divine. In matters of the doctrine of the Eucharist this had led to the formulation of the dogma of transubstantiation by the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215.[160] Wyclif understood this dogma as teaching

---

[157] The standard biography remains Herbert B. Workman, *John Wyclif: A Study of the English Medieval Church*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1926). For a concise introduction to his thought (with references to recent literature), see Anthony Kenny, *Wyclif* (Oxford–New York, 1985) and *idem*, 'Wyclif', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 72 (1986 [= 1987]) 91–113. For a lucid treatment of Wyclif's eucharistic thought, paying attention to contemporaries and precursors, see J.I. Catto, 'John Wyclif and the Cult of the Eucharist', in Katherine Walsh and Diana Wood, edd., *The Bible in the Medieval World: Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*. Studies in Church History; Subsidia, 4 (Oxford, 1985), pp. 269–286.

[158] John Wyclif, *Opus euangelicum* II, p. 160.3–7: "Sacramentum altaris est verum corpus Christi et verus panis sicut Christus est verus Deus et verus homo."

[159] See, *e.g.*, *De eucharistia*, p. 34.

[160] *De apostasia*, pp. 65–66, 122, 175; *De eucharistia*, pp. 140–142, 223–224, 272–274, 278, 311, 315; *Trialogus*, p. 262. The argument that the dogma of transubstantiation was not included in the Apostolic Creed, and hence was not trustworthy, had already been refuted by Alain of Lille, who argued that it was implied by the article of the communion of the saints.

that the material substance of the bread disappears after its consecration by the priest; the quiddity of the bread is removed, while accidental properties like taste and smell remain.[161] This doctrine of *annihilatio* creates "accidents without subjects" but, according to Wyclif, as such it creates nothing and therefore is a symbol of sin. The notion of the existence of the accidents of the bread (its colour, taste, smell and odour) independently of its substance is in direct contradiction to Wyclif's moderately realistic ontology, according to which accidental being is added to existential being as the quality to a substance.[162] The widespread acceptance of such ideas was one of the developments that convinced Wyclif that the devil and antichrist had seized dominion in the church.[163]

In his discussion of the Eucharist Wyclif often objects to this doctrine of *accidentia sine subiecto*, which he reveals as a recent invention. In this context he contrasts the Decretals of Innocent III with the *articuli fidei* of the early church.[164] In his *Trialogus* Wyclif posits that the heresy of the *annihilatio* has been introduced into the church by Satan and his followers.[165] He adds that this was a masterly ruse. According to Wyclif, the devil must have reasoned

> When I, through my vicar the antichrist, can so delude believers that they will deny that this sacrament is bread but instead make them believe that it is an accident [*accidens maxime abhominabile*], then I can get them to believe anything […] Undoubtedly these simple believers can gradually be made to say that no matter how a prelate lives, be he *luxuriosus*, *homicida*, *simoniacus*, or otherwise in error, he may never be believed to be so by his subjects.

---

[161] See *De eucharistia*, p. 48.

[162] See Anthony Kenny, 'Realism and Determinism in the early Wyclif', in Anne Hudson and Michael Wilks, edd., *From Ockham to Wyclif*. Studies in Church History; Subsidia, 5 (Oxford, 1987), pp. 165–177. William J. Courtenay, *Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth-Century England* (Princeton, 1987), is illuminating on the historical background of Wyclif's philosophical and theological principles, while the late medieval philosophical debates are discussed in great detail in Norman Kretzmann, Anthony Kenny and Jan Pinborg, edd., *The Cambridge History of Late Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Desintegration of Scholasticism, 1100–1600* (Cambridge, 1982).

[163] See also, M.J. Wilks, 'The early Oxford Wyclif: Papalist or Nominalist?', in G.J. Cuming, ed., *The Church and Academic Learning*. Studies in Church History, 5 (Leiden, 1969), pp. 69–98.

[164] Wyclif, *De apostasia*, pp. 130, 134, 174; Thomas Netter of Walden, *Doctrinale fidei Catholicae* (Paris, 1521; ed. Bonaventura Blanciotti, 3 vols., Venice, 1757–1759 [repr. Farnborough, 1967]), V,18 (= vol. II, pp. 127–133).

[165] *Trialogus*, p. 262.

This the simple faithful must believe of the pope as well.[166] The *abominatio desolationis* of which Mt 24,15 speaks must be applied, said Wyclif, to this heresy concerning the host.[167]

That these passages parallel analogous statements by Hoen is easy to recognize. Hoen's (admittedly rudimentary) understanding of the development of church history corresponds with that of Wyclif: Hoen wrote that the dogma of transubstantiation was already suspect because it was not included in the Apostolic Confession but in the papal Decretals. Just as the pope, or rather the devil, makes people believe that the bread *is* God, so he is also free to do such miracles as making a saint or venerable bishop out of the greatest criminal. Although their acts show they are not (just as the appearance of the eucharistic bread proves that it is not the body of Christ) they are believed to be holy, even though the senses testify to the contrary.[168]

This appeal to the senses and *experientia* to combat transubstantiation also connects Hoen with Wyclif. Wyclif's view that this dogma flagrantly opposes what the eyes see and the senses detect, and that what is presented as a miracle must be evaluated accordingly,[169] is repeated by Hoen. Here Wyclif favours the example of mice, whose senses (as opposed to the senses of those who err on the doctrine of the Eucharist) do not deceive them: they recognize the host as bread and simply eat it.[170] Wyclif accordingly makes fun of the opinion which holds that a mouse that puts its teeth into the host is eating the body of Christ.[171] According to Wyclif, the body of Christ is eaten only *spiritualiter* and he cites Ps 15,10 which says that Christ will not see corruption (*sanctus tuus non videret corrupcionem*). From these words Wyclif infers that a mouse

---

166 *Trialogus*, p. 268.

167 *Trialogus*, p. 268: "[…] sicut videtur illud explanatum superius Matth. xxiv, 'cum videritis abhominationem desolationis sedere in loco sancto' [Mt 24,15], in haeresim de ista hostia redundare."

168 See *Trialogus*, p. 268 and Z IV, 516.21–517.5; 517.24–36.

169 *Trialogus*, p. 261: "Et sic antichristus in ista haeresi destruit grammaticam, logicam, et scientiam naturalem; sed quod magis dolendum est, tollit sensum Evangelii"; *De eucharistia*, p. 299: "[…] non sunt fingenda miracula sine patencia racionis."

170 *Trialogus*, pp. 257–258: "Mures enim et aliae bestiae istud noscunt, cum secundum philosophos de suo esibili habent notitiam"; *ibidem*, p. 260: "Mures autem habent servatam notitiam de panis substantia sicut primo, sed istis infidelibus istud deest." See also *De apostasia*, p. 58.

171 *De eucharistia*, p. 11: "Arguunt enim quod sus, canis vel mus potest comedere Deum nostrum, quia corpus Christi quod est Deus." Thomas, *Summa* III,80,3 proposed that mice ate the body of Christ *per accidens* and not *sacramentaliter*.

does not eat the body of Christ even if he eats it *corporaliter*.[172] Hoen also cited this verse and stated that the consecrated bread does spoil and is eaten by mice, and thus he too inferred that the bread cannot be equated with Christ.[173]

Wyclif saw the adoration and veneration of the host as an abominable consequence of the dogma of transubstantiation, a consequence that was worse than the *idolatria* of the heathen.[174] Hoen posed the question of how far those who venerate the host and worship it are removed from heathens who venerate wood and stone.[175] Wyclif also regarded the idea of the consecrating priest creating the body of Christ as an aberration that followed from the prevailing doctrine of the sacrament. The Bible teaches that Christ is the only begotten Son of the Father, who was conceived by the Holy Spirit and who assumed flesh and blood in the Virgin Mary, but not that some priest daily makes the body of Christ.[176] Similarly, Hoen wrote that one can read in the Scriptures that Christ became incarnate, but once only, in Mary's womb; he does not daily become bread in the hands of a priest.[177] Here Hoen uses

---

[172] *De eucharistia*, p. 18: "[…] caro Christi et sanguis solum spiritualiter solent comedi; nam Deus ordinauit eternaliter quod *sanctus tuus non videret corrupcionem* in aliquo membro suo. Patet […] quod nec bestia nec prescitus manducat corporaliter sacramentum." See also *Trialogus*, p. 273, where the following argument is refuted: "iste panis putrefit vel a mure comeditur; ille idem panis est corpus Christi; ergo corpus Christi sic putrefit atque comeditur." And see Wyclif's *Responsiones ad XLIV conclusiones*, in *Opera minora*, Johann Loserth, ed. (London, 1913), pp. 201–257, at p. 253: "Ista hostia videtur in missa oculo corporali quod a sacerdote frangitur et postea a mure comeditur. Et ipsa est corpus Christi: ergo corpus Christi taliter transmutatur; sed quid horribilius?"

[173] Ep. 229.36–230.3: "Propterea scriptum est Psalmo quindecimo: *Non dabis sanctum tuum videre corruptionem*. Sed panis consecratus corrumpitur et a muribus comeditur, vt patet experientia: ergo panis consecratus non est Christus."

[174] *De eucharistia*, pp. 13–14: "nam tam layci quam clerici nimis multi sunt tantum infideles in ista materia quod credunt paganis detrius quod hostia illa consecrata sit Deus illorum"; *De eucharistia*, pp. 317–318: "Et in ista ydolatria nos vocati Christiani peccamus sepe plus barbaris adorando sanctorum ymagines, reliquias et sacramentum altaris […] Et hinc creditur apostolum tam crebro vocare sacramentum altaris panem"; *Trialogus*, p. 269: "Ideo oportet hos fratres [sc. the mendicant friars—BJS] dicere, quod populus adorans hanc hostiam vt corpus Domini sit idolatria de lumine fidei desolatus."

[175] Ep. 227.3–8: "Cernimus enim, per hanc panem consecratum adorari et modis omnibus honorari pro Deo, qui si Deus non est, rogo, quantum ab illis ethnicis, qui ligna et lapides coluerunt, distamus? Putabant enim illis numen inesse, quod non erat, nec lapides voluissent adorasse, nisi prius illos temerarii deos esse credidissent."

[176] *De eucharistia*, pp. 15–16: "Nichil enim horribilius quam quod quilibet sacerdos celebrans facit vel consecrat cotidie corpus Christi."

[177] Ep. 228.3–6: "Legimus Christum incarnatum, sed semel tantum, et hoc in vtero virginis […] Quod autem Christus quotidie impanatur (vt ita loquar) in manibus cuiusvis sacrificuli neque a prophetis est praedictum neque ab apostolis praedicatum."

the verb *impanari*, which Wyclif had already used to denote the doctrine he refuted.[178]

When Wyclif considers how the bread is the body of Christ without becoming identical with it, he argues that a predicate can be given to something in three different ways. He distinguishes between a *predicatio formalis*, *essentialis* and *habitudinalis*. Christ's words *Hoc est corpus meum*, Wyclif maintains, must be interpreted according to the *predicatio habitudinalis* or figurative way of speaking. This type of expression occurs frequently in Scripture and Wyclif cites the texts "John is Elijah" (Mt 11,14), "the rock was Christ" (ICor 10,4) and the verses in Genesis (41–42) where the seven ears of wheat and the seven fatted cows are said to be seven fertile years. It is remarkable (thus Wyclif quotes Augustine) that the text does not state that the ears of wheat and the cows *signify* seven years, but that they *are* seven years. In the same way, Wyclif argues, the Bible states that the *panis sacramentalis* is the *corpus Christi*. When it is said that the bread is the body of Christ, this must be taken figuratively: the bread *ipsum corpus sacramentaliter signat vel figurat*.[179] These views of the Bible's metaphorical language are reflected in Hoen's *Epistola*. The latter argues that the word 'est' in the Bible is often not meant literally and uses the *loci* cited by Wyclif in addition to other similar examples.[180]

B. *Jan Hus (ca. 1370–1415)*[181]

From the last decades of the fourteenth century, Wyclif's ideas found a well-prepared soil in Bohemia. Since the reign of Charles IV (1346–1378) humanism had spread there,[182] and Konrad Waldhauser

[178] *Trialogus*, pp. 269–272: "Doctrina de impanatione improbatur."

[179] *Trialogus*, pp. 266–269; *De eucharistia*, pp. 100–101, 119–120, 230–231; *De apostasia*, pp. 51, 115–116. For Augustine, see *Quaestionum in Heptateuchum libri septem* III,57 (CCSL 33, p. 216).

[180] Ep. 228.10–28; 232.27–34. This parallel between Hoen's treatise and Wyclif's *Trialogus* was noted by Hartmut Hilgenfeld, *Mittelalterlich-traditionelle Elemente in Luthers Abendmahlsschriften*. Studien zur Dogmengeschichte und systematischen Theologie, 29 (Zürich, 1971), p. 50.

[181] On Hus, see Ernst Werner, *Jan Hus: Welt und Umwelt eines Prager Frühreformators*. Forschungen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte, 34 (Weimar, 1991).

[182] See Eduard Winter, *Frühhumanismus: Seine Entwicklung in Böhmen und deren europäischen Bedeutung für die Kirchenreformbestrebungen im 14. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1964) and Ferdinand Seibt, 'Gab es einen böhmischen Frühhumanismus?', in Hans-Bernard Harder and

(ca. 1326–1369), Jan Milíc of Kremsier (d. 1374), Thomas of Stitny (ca. 1333–ca. 1401) and above all Matthias of Janov (ca. 1350–ca. 1393) had censured ecclesiastical abuses and formulated proposals for reform. This home-grown tradition, as well as the writings of Wyclif, which were known in Prague from the last decade of the fourteenth century, influenced Jan Hus.[183] Jerome of Prague probably brought Wyclif's *De eucharistia* and *Trialogus* from Oxford, where he stayed from 1399 to 1401. Apparently Hus had translated part or all of the *Trialogus* into Czech by 1403.[184] Johann Loserth's study of the relationship between Wyclif and Hus shows that Hus frequently cited this as well as other writings by Wyclif, without, however, mentioning his source.[185] An early work by Hus (*De sanguine Christi*, 1405–1406), written when he was still relatively unknown outside Prague, needs to be studied, because in it he appears to have elaborated Wyclif's application of Mt 24 to "the heresy of the host".[186]

This treatise emerged from an actual controversy. In the village of Wilsnack (Brandenburg), a priest had found three red hosts in the ruins of a church. As a result of this alleged discovery of Christ's blood, Wilsnack became a very popular place of pilgrimage.[187] Opposition to this practice emerged and in 1405 the University of Prague appointed a committee of three, among them Jan Hus, to go to Wilsnack and there to examine the truth of the miracle. Their extremely negative report prompted a ban on pilgrimages to the village. The academic disputes over this issue are reflected in Hus's *quaestio de sanguine Christi*, in which

---

Hans Rothe, edd., *Studien zum Humanismus in den böhmischen Ländern* (Cologne–Vienna, 1988), pp. 1–19.

[183] R.R. Betts, 'English and Czech Influences on the Hussite Movement', in Betts, *Essays in Czech History* (London, 1969), pp. 132–159; Malcolm Lambert, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation* (2nd ed.; Oxford, 1992), pp. 284–300.

[184] See F. Smahel, '*Doctor evangelicus super omnes evangelistas*: Wyclif's Fortune in Hussite Bohemia', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 43 (1970) 16–34; Thomson, *The Latin Writings of John Wyclif*, p. 81, note 6.

[185] Johann Loserth, *Huss und Wyclif* (2nd ed.; Munich–Berlin, 1925), index s.v. 'Trialogus'; see especially p. 81.

[186] See note 167.

[187] See P. Browe, *Die eucharistischen Wunder des Mittelalters*. Breslauer Studien zur historischen Theologie, Neue Folge, 4 (Breslau, 1938); Ludger Meier, 'Wilsnack als Spiegel deutscher Vorreformation', *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 3 (1951) 53–69; Hartmut Boockmann, 'Der Streit um das Wilsnacker Blut: Zur Situation des deutschen Klerus in der Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts', *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung* 9 (1982) 385–408.

he responds to the question of whether Christ left his blood behind on earth. Hus defends the opinion that Christ, at the moment of his resurrection, glorified the blood that flowed out of his side; the body of Christ and his exalted blood now reside *localiter and dimensiue* at the Father's right hand in heaven, and both are only *realiter et vere* present on earth in the sacrament of the altar.[188] His answer therefore is that the glorified blood of Christ is no longer on earth and that the miracle of Wilsnack is nothing more than peasant trickery inspired by the avarice of the clergy. The "seducers of the people" (*populi reductores*) who invite the faithful to venerate something that is present "locally and visibly on earth" (*localiter et visibiliter super terram*) as the blood of Christ are, according to Hus, "angels of the Antichrist" (*Antichristi nunccii*). Hus also cites Christ's prophecy in Mt 24,11, according to which many pseudo-prophets will emerge who will deceive the people with miracles. Just as Christ said that at the end of time many will come and proclaim, "See, Christ is here or there", so there are many now who say, "See, here is the blood of Christ". Hus pointed out that Christ's prophecy was thus being fulfilled in his own day through those who deceived the people into venerating Christ on earth as if he was locally present in a consecrated host.[189] With this background in place it becomes clear that both Hoen's application of Mt 24,23 to the doctrine of the Eucharist and his belief that Christ's warning in this text concerned his own time were not unprecedented. Two more passages of Hus's treatise are echoed in Hoen's *Epistola*.

---

[188] Hus, *De sanguine Christi*, p. 7: "Vnde patet vlterius, quod nullus sangwis Christi est nostris temporibus localiter et visibiliter super terram, quia corpus Christi cum omnibus partibus suis solum in celo est localiter et dimensiue, licet in sacramento altaris sit realiter et vere." See also p. 20: "[…] vbi Christus est in dextera Dei patris et vbicumque est in sacramento venerabili, oculis corporalibus absconditus […]".

[189] Hus, *De sanguine Christi*, pp. 28, 29, 30: "[…] dyaboli scientes mundum redimi per sangwinem Christi, ordinauerunt sibi ante simulachrum sangwinem offeri, vt sic deciperent Christianos […] Ex quibus patet, quod mali spiritus per se et per homines malos procurant miracula, vt decipiant christicolas et seducant. Sic enim nunc maligni spiritus per malignos sacerdotes procurant sangwinem in hostia […] Et sunt multa alia loca, in quibus maligni spiritus per malignos presbiteros sangwinem pretensum propter auariciam ordinauerunt, qui per mendacia seducunt populum, vt inpleretur verbum Christi Matth 24 [Mt 24,11–12]: 'Multi pseudoprophete surgent et seducent multos. Et quoniam habundauit iniquitas (sc. illorum sacerdotum) et refrigescet karitas multorum (sc. subditorum)' […] Cum autem temporibus vltimus erit seduccio astussima et fortissima, sic vt si possibile esset, electi seducantur. dicente Christo Mth 24 [Mt 24,23]: 'Si quis vobis dixerit "Ecce hic Christus aut illic" nolite credere' […] Nunc autem multi dicunt 'ecce ibi est sangwis Christi apparens visibiliter'."

While agreeing with the argument that the visibly present blood of Christ more easily moves people to believe (as was proven by the example of Thomas Dydimus), Hus warns against drawing incorrect conclusions from this. It pleased Christ to hide his blood from his bride to her benefit. In support of this view Hus cites John 16,7: "Expedit vobis vt ego vadam".[190] Answering a second objection, that Christ according to his absolute power could have willed that some of his blood would not be glorified, Hus maintains that this would indeed be possible according to Christ's *potencia absoluta*, but that Christ according to his ordained power (*de potencia ordinata*, that is, *de facto*) could not will that a certain quantity of his blood not be glorified, because the Holy Spirit said through the mouth of David, *Non dabis sanctum tuum videre corrupcionem* (Ps 15,10). As we have seen, both texts were also cited by Hoen in support of his rejection of the dogma of transubstantiation.

In his treatise *De sex erroribus*, Hus censures the errors of creation, of faith, of remission, of obedience, of anathema and of simony. Under *error creationis* Hus placed (as had Wyclif before him) the error of priests who, in their pride and exaltation, believe that they can create at will the body of Christ and that they are more worthy than Mary: she brought him forth only once, while the priests create him repeatedly.[191] As we have seen, Hoen used the same argument. Moreover, Hoen's opposition to the adoration of the host and to the withholding of the cup from the laity also suggests the Bohemian background of his arguments.[192]

At this point of our exposition, having established the historical background and sources of Hoen's distinctive arguments and of the premises of his argument, it is necessary to assess the traditions behind the argu-

---

[190] Hus, *De sanguine Christi*, p. 12: "Sed quia sibi placet sangwinem suum nunc esse insensibilem et creditum, sicud et ipse absconsus sponse sue ecclesie militanti wult esse pro maiori merito,—inde est, quod plus Christus nobis absconditus et sangwis suus, quam diu viuamus, proficit, quam si nobis visibiliter apparet […] Et hinc dixit ad discipulos, Joann. 16: 'Veritatem dico vobis, expedit vobis vt ego vadam'." See also *De sanguine Christi*, p. 25.

[191] See Iohannes Hus, *De sex erroribus*, in Bohumil Ryba, ed., *Betlemské texty* (Prague, 1951), pp. 39–63 and pp. 65–103, at pp. 41 and pp. 67–70; Jan Hus, *Schriften zur Glaubensreform und Briefe der Jahre 1414–1415*, Walther Schamschula, ed. (Frankfurt, 1969), pp. 27–30.

[192] Ep. 227.3–8; 232.3–15.

ments propounded by Wyclif and Hus, before answering the question of how these currents of dissent may have reached Hoen. The next two sections will deal with these subjects respectively.

C. *Berengar and the Cathars*

As R.W. Southern demonstrated in his study on Berengar of Tours,[193] the importance of Berengar's contribution to the eucharistic debate lay in his audacious attempt to apply logical analysis to theological doctrine. The master of the ancient school of St Martin in Tours, the pupil of Bishop Fulbert of Chartres, Berengar consciously applied the Boethian corpus of logical writings (the *vetus logica*) to one of the most important ecclesiastical doctrines. A lack of consensus over it had come to the surface in the ninth century, when Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie (whose work Berengar mistakenly attributed to John the Scot, Eriugena) had crossed swords. Berengar's method and the results it yielded led, however, to his condemnation at the Roman Councils of 1050, 1059 and 1079. His revocation of 1059—*Ego Berengarius*—was included in the most important collections of canon law and thus became widely diffused. Though subject to conflicting interpretations, it became accepted as orthodox doctrine.[194] His treatise in response to an attack by Lanfranc of Bec has, however, only been transmitted in one manuscript. The gnesio-Lutheran Matthias Flacius Illyricus (1520–1575) possessed it, and it was rediscovered by the German philosopher Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729–1781) in Wolfenbüttel in 1770. It has only recently seen a critical edition worthy of its unique importance, by the Leiden medio-Latinist R.B.C. Huygens.[195]

---

[193] R.W. Southern, 'Lanfranc of Bec and Berengar of Tours', in R.W. Hunt, W.A. Pantin and R.W. Southern, edd., *Studies in Medieval History presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke* (Oxford, 1948), pp. 27–48; see also H. Liebeschütz, 'Berengar of Tours: An Attempt at Applying Logical Analysis to Theological Doctrine', in A.H. Armstrong, ed., *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy* (2nd ed.; Cambridge, 1970 [1980]), pp. 600–608.

[194] For the text of this confession, composed by Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida, see J. de Montclos, *Lanfranc et Bérenger: la controverse eucharistique du XIe siècle*, pp. 171–172.

[195] Beringerius Turonensis, *Rescriptum contra Lanfrannum*, R.B.C. Huygens, ed. CCCM 84 (Turnhout, 1988). On the history of the manuscript, see Wolfgang Milde, 'Einleitung', in Beringerius Turonensis, *Rescriptum contra Lanfrannum. Faksimileausgabe der Handschrift Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek Cod. Guelf. 101 Weissenburg.* CCCM 84A (Turnhout, 1988), pp. 6–20.

Many aspects of Berengar's life and doctrine have been the subject of scholarly research;[196] our concern here is with some essential arguments Berengar propounded against the realistic interpretation of Christ's presence in the Eucharist (as defended, for example, by Paschasius and repeated by Lanfranc). Discussing the transformation of matter (of the sacramental bread and wine), Berengar argued that a subject and its qualities are intimately connected, and he thought that the thesis expounded by Lanfranc and Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida, namely that after consecration the eucharistic bread and wine change into the true body and blood of Christ, flatly contradicted this. For Berengar, qualities could not exist without the matter of which they were accidents (that is, the qualities of the bread cannot continue to exist after the bread, at consecration, has been annihilated); pure forms (qualities) were not the object of observation (the whiteness of the bread does not exist without the bread being white).[197]

If then, the consecrated bread was not the body of Christ, what was it? It was, according to Berengar, a material sign (*figura* or *pignus*) of the divine presence;[198] by the consecration a spiritual reality was added to the sacramental matter which thus—*per assumptionem* and the resulting inward grace[199]—became an effective instrument of salvation (*signum efficax*).[200] Consecration brought about a change which affected the bread and wine, but this change did not annihilate their substance, the intangible underlying reality in which the accidental qualities exist—both *sacramentum* and *res* retained their proper being. As he believed that there was a significant difference between consecrated and unconsecrated bread, Berengar was no mere symbolist, but he did use figurative

[196] See especially A.J. MacDonald, *Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine* (London, 1930); R.B.C. Huygens, 'A propos de Bérenger et son traité de l'Eucharistie', *Revue Bénédictine* 76 (1966) 133–139; J. de Montclos, *Lanfranc et Bérenger*; Henry Chadwick, '*Ego Berengarius*', *Journal of Theological Studies*, new series, 40 (1989) 414–445; Peter Ganz, R.B.C. Huygens and Friedrich Niewöhner, edd., *Auctoritas und Ratio: Studien zu Berengar von Tours*. Wolfenbütteler Mittelalter Studien, 2 (Wiesbaden, 1990).

[197] Compare Boethius, *In Isagogen Porphyrii* I,2 (CSEL 48, p. 6.5–6): "[…] vt neque accidens sine substantia neque sine accidenti substantia esse posset."

[198] See Berengar, *Rescriptum contra Lanfrannum* I, 296–304 (pp. 43–44); I, 428–433 (pp. 47–48) and III, 691–697 (p. 209).

[199] Thus Berengar in his *In purgatoria epistola* to Adelmann of Liège, edited by De Montclos, *Lanfranc et Bérenger*, pp. 531–538, at p. 534.78.

[200] See *Rescriptum contra Lanfrannum* II, 522–529 (p. 115) and III, 692 (p. 209).

language to explain Christ's presence in the Eucharist. Furthermore, he formulated arguments which reoccur in the thought of Wyclif, Hus and Hoen.

Contemporaries regarded Wyclif as *Berengarius redivivus*; one of his opponents, Thomas Netter of Walden, spoke, for instance, of Berengar as Wyclif's master (*magister eius Berengarius*).[201] Yet Wyclif could easily appeal to the confession of 1059 (which was subject to many interpretations),[202] and gladly did so to vindicate his belief that the sacramental signs survive consecration, asserting that the confession requires a figurative explanation.[203] Though apparently this confession is the only text by Berengar that Wyclif knew, several of Wyclif's ideas are anticipated in Berengar's *Rescriptum*, as follows:

1. There is an elaborate passage in Berengar's treatise on the *locutio tropica* which clearly foreshadows Wyclif's views on the subject. Berengar argues that the words 'panis, qui ponitur in altari, post consecrationem *est* corpus Christi et vinum sanguis' (italics added) need to be interpreted tropically, as figurative speech, analogous to *loci* such as 'Christus est summus angularis lapis' (Eph 2,20; IPt 2,6), 'Christus est leo' (cf. Apc 5,5), 'Christus est agnus' (cf. Io 1, 29 and 36) and 'petra Christus erat' (ICor 10,4). Here Berengar was referring to Augustine, who wrote that 'petra' was 'Christus in signo'.[204]
2. Berengar emphatically asserted that Christ's risen body was at the Father's right hand in heaven, impassible and invulnerable, and could not possibly be in two places at the same time.[205] Christ's glorified body therefore could not be broken in the priest's hands, nor torn apart by the teeth of the faithful. Accordingly, Berengar cited Ps 15,10 to criticize the idea of the real presence of Christ's

[201] See the learned note in Anne Hudson, *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford, 1988), pp. 286–287 (note 47).

[202] See Chadwick, '*Ego Berengarius*', who meticulously describes the efforts of many theologians to explain away the offensive grossness of some formulations in the confession.

[203] See *De eucharistia*, pp. 24–28, 30–35, 225–226 for instances.

[204] *Rescriptum* I, 1357–1396 (pp. 73–74); Augustine, *Tractatus in Iohannem* 26,12 (CCL 36, p. 266.16–17). A similar view had already been expressed by Ratramnus, *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, J.N. Bakhuizen van den Brink, ed. (Amsterdam–London, 1974), pp. 44–46.

[205] *Rescriptum* II, 839–844 (p. 124) and II, 1781–1782 (p. 149); see also Lanfranc, *De corpore et sanguine Domini aduersus Berengarium Turonensem*, MPL 150, pp. 407–442, at p. 421A.

body in the Eucharist.[206] In this context, Berengar also wrote that the incorruptible body of Christ could not be equated with the consecrated host, for the reason that the host was eaten by animals and birds, and desecrated by fire and putrefaction.[207]

3. Berengar also appealed to the testimony of the senses (contrary to the confession of 1059 which stated that Christ's body was also present *sensualiter*, within the realm of the five senses).[208] In Berengar's opinion it was apparent to the senses that the bread and wine were not changed into flesh and blood and he saw no reason to think that the senses were deceived in supposing the bread to be bread and the wine to be wine.[209]

Another argument formulated by Berengar is relevant in establishing the historical background of Hoen's views. Even though this argument played no role in Wyclif's thought, Hoen treated it elaborately. From Berengar's *Rescriptum* it appears (and this is confirmed by Lanfranc's treatise of 1063) that Lanfranc had brought forward against Berengar's view the well-known and authoritative passage by Ambrose, that manna and the eucharistic bread are not equivalent.[210] In response Berengar discussed the *distantia corporis ad manna*[211] and cited from Augustine's *Tractatus in Iohannem* a passage to support his view: both manna and the eucharistic bread signify Christ's body, being different signs of the same *res*.[212]

Another of Berengar's earliest opponents, Durand, abbot of Troarn (who in 1053–1054 composed his *Liber de corpore et sanguine Christi contra Berengarium et eius sectatores*) defended the traditional view that the manna and the rock ('petra') were *figurae* or *umbrae* of Christ, and added that his body, on the contrary, was *Dominicae figura substantiae*, a symbol of the Lord's substance. The manna as well as the *petra*, therefore, was *figura*

---

[206] *Rescriptum* II, 2919–2920 (p. 181).
[207] *Rescriptum* III, 518–523 (p. 204).
[208] See J. de Montlos, *Lanfranc et Bérenger*, p. 172.
[209] *Rescriptum* II, 70–102 (pp. 102–103); II, 204–221 (p. 106); II, 757–866 (pp. 122–124); III, 749–765 (pp. 210–211).
[210] *Rescriptum* II, 614–625 (pp. 117–118); see also *Rescriptum* II, 730–731 (p. 121) and II, 984–985 (p. 128); Lanfranc, *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, MPL 150, pp. 419D–420B.
[211] *Rescriptum* II, 864–879 (pp. 124–125).
[212] *Rescriptum* II, 1673–1678; St Augustine, *Tractatus in Iohannem* 26,12 (CCL 36, p. 265.1–4: "hunc panem significauit manna, hunc panem significat altare Dei, in signis diuersa sunt, in re quae significatur paria"). See also *Rescriptum* I, 441–443 and III, 203–205.

figurae. In sum, "illic quippe fuit vmbra, hic veritas est ipsa", that is, they had the shadow, but we have the truth.[213]

This discussion is also echoed in Adelman of Liège's *Ad Berengarium epistola* (before 1059), which equates the eucharistic bread with the bread spoken of in John 6.[214] As we have seen, Alger of Liège (1050–ca. 1132) later took up a quite subtle position; he conceded substantial change in the sacrament, but at the same time emphasized its spiritual implications. In his *De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Dominici* (ca. 1110–1115) he thus approvingly cited Augustine's saying, "petra significabat Christum", as well as the verse to which Berengar had referred.[215] The denial of the inequivalence of manna and the eucharistic bread and the conclusion drawn, that just like manna the eucharistic bread was a (mere) sign of Christ's body, was a dissenting argument which resurfaced at various times and places. It reoccurred, for instance, in a fifteenth-century Hussite text from the Low Countries (which will be discussed later) while in 1472 a priest from Arras could not agree to the adoration of the host because the manna in the desert had not been venerated either.[216]

The first three arguments discussed here would re-emerge in Wyclif's writings on the Eucharist, but he was not the first to revive them. Several of these and similar arguments were mentioned and refuted in numerous writings by orthodox theologians against the sect of the Cathars,[217] who appear to have been the first heirs to Berengar's ideas.[218] Their precise relationship to Berengar's thought remains unex-

---

[213] Durand, *Liber de corpore et sanguine Christi aduersus Berengarium et eius sectatores*, MPL 149, pp. 1375–1424, at pp. 1394A–B, 1398A.

[214] Adelman, *Ad Berengarium epistola*, in R. Heurtevent, *Durand de Troarn* (Paris, 1912), pp. 287–303, at p. 295 (= MPL 143, pp. 1289–1296, at p. 1294D).

[215] Alger, MPL 180, pp. 761D–762A. Alger's views are discussed in Henri de Lubac, *Corpus mysticum: l'eucharistie au Moyen Age* (2nd ed.; Paris, 1949), pp. 166–167, 173–175, as well as by Van Engen, *Rupert of Deutz*, *passim*. For Augustine, see *Sermo* CCCLII,3 (MPL 39, pp. 1549–1560, at pp. 1551–1553).

[216] Fredericq I, no. 353 (pp. 431–432).

[217] The Waldensians criticized the validity of the Eucharist if administered by unworthy priests and their concern was, secondly, with the correct ritual of the Mass. They were, however, mistaken for Cathars and hence Cathar opinions were attributed to them.

[218] For this section my essential guides were Joseph de Ghellinck, 'Eucharistie au XIIe siècle en occident', *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* V (Paris, 1924), pp. 1233–1302, at pp. 1239–1243 ('Polémique contre les cathares, vaudois et autres sectes hérétiques'), and Gary Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period: A Study of the Salvific*

plained; Gary Macy suggested that though there is no historical link between Berengar and the Cathars and other heretical groups, these groups used some of Berengar's teachings (or alleged teachings) "to frustrate their orthodox foes. The texts were ready to hand in the works of Durand, Guitmund and Alger".[219]

The Cathars, originating from the Greek east, are mentioned in western Europe from about the second half of the twelfth century (Cologne, 1143) and subsequently had their centres in southern France and northern Italy. Innocent III's heavy-handed crusade dealt the movement a decisive blow, though adherents were active through the entire thirteenth century. The Cathars formed a serious threat to the traditional and wealthy church, as their propagation of an ascetic apostolic life appeared attractive to members of all social strata in contemporary society. The mainstream of the movement formulated a radical dualism, contrasting the God of the Old Testament and his evil creation with the good God who had revealed himself through one of his angels, Christ, who in a feigned body on earth taught his disciples delivery from evil matter by abstinence and purification. Because ecclesiastical ceremonies and images were regarded as part of an evil creation, the Cathars rejected the Mass. In their rejection they often used arguments derived from primitive logic; one of them was that Christ's body must have been as big as a mountain to feed the faithful for so long.[220] Nevertheless, such arguments posed serious problems

---

Function of the Sacrament according to the Theologians, c. 1080– c. 1220 (Oxford, 1984), esp. pp. 58–59; Gary Macy, 'Of Mice and Manna: Quid Mus Sumit as a Pastoral Question', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 58 (1991) 157–166. On the Cathars, the classic remains Arno Borst, *Die Katharer*. Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 12 (Stuttgart, 1953; repr. Freiburg, 1991); concise surveys and relevant bibliographical information can be found in Herbert Grundmann, *Ketzergeschichte des Mittelalters*. Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte II/G/1 (3th ed.; Göttingen, 1978), pp. 22–28; Herbert Grundmann, *Bibliographie zur Ketzergeschichte des Mittelalters (1900–1966)*. Sussidi eruditi, 20 (Rome, 1967); Lambert, *Medieval Heresy*, pp. 44–61 and 105–146, and Alexander Patschovsky, 'Nachwort', in the 1991 reprint of Borst's study, pp. 327–334.

[219] Gary Macy, 'Berengar's Legacy as Heresiarch', in Ganz, Huygens and Niewöhner, edd., *Auctoritas und Ratio*, pp. 47–67, at p. 67.

[220] See De Ghellinck, 'Eucharistie au XIIe siècle en occident', p. 1242; Borst, *Die Katharer*, p. 217, note 14, and Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period*, p. 58 (and p. 161, note 118). In one of extremely few written texts by the Cathars themselves, Christ's words of institution are given a most remarkable spiritualistic interpretation, the bread being regarded as Christ's law and the blood as the spiritual meaning of the New Testament; see A. Dondaine, ed., *Un traité néo-manichéen du XIIIe siècle: le 'Liber de duobus principiis', suivi d'un fragment de rituel cathare* (Rome, 1939), pp. 151–165, at p. 154.

to the defenders of orthodoxy—had not Lanfranc, after all, argued that at the consecration the priest created *de novo* a little fragment of Christ's body, which was then offered to the Father during Mass?[221] A serious obstacle in establishing the doctrinal opinions of the Cathars is the fact that very little written evidence has survived. This objection, however, is met by references to the polemical writings of their Catholic opponents, which appear to be well-informed; recently discovered Cathar texts confirm their descriptions,[222] and in the enumeration of Cathar and other heretical arguments against established eucharistic doctrine in particular, these polemical writings show a remarkable consensus. In fact, their arguments dictated a substantial part of the theological agenda.[223]

A most important source, for instance, is Alain of Lille's *De fide Catholica contra haereticos sui temporis* (ca. 1180).[224] Alain spent a considerable length of time in southern France and dedicated his book "against the heretics of his time" to Count William VIII of Montpellier (1152–1202). Alain obtained his information on the teaching of the groups he attacked from personal contacts and appears to have relied "on summaries or articuli of their teachings that were being circulated, though the Cathars endeavoured not to publicize their doctrines".[225] Alain records as one of their arguments (also found in Wyclif and Hoen) that the doctrine of transubstantiation cannot be an *articulus fidei* because it is not mentioned in any early Christian creed. Alain's reply was to the effect that in the primitive church the dogma was not under discus-

---

[221] See Henry Chadwick, 'Symbol and Reality: Berengar and the Appeal to the Fathers', in Ganz, Huygens and Niewöhner, edd., *Auctoritas und Ratio*, pp. 26–45, at p. 33.

[222] See Grundmann, *Ketzergeschichte des Mittelalters*, pp. 27–28.

[223] See De Ghellinck, 'Eucharistie au XII siècle en occident', p. 1240; Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period*, p. 58. See also Lorenzo Paolini, 'Italian Catharism and Written Culture', in Peter Biller and Anne Hudson, edd., *Heresy and Literacy, ca. 1000– ca. 1530* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 83–103, who demonstrates that the opponents of the Cathars gave a fair impression of their views and arguments.

[224] MPL 210, pp. 305–430, at pp. 359–365. On this work, see G. Raynaud de Lage, *Alain de Lille: poète du XIIe siècle* (Montreal–Paris, 1951), pp. 28–31 and 176–177; Borst, *Die Katharer*, pp. 9–10; Cesare Vasoli, 'Il *Contra haereticos* di Alano di Lilla', *Bullettino dell' Istituto storico per il medio evo* 75 (1963) 123–172, especially at pp. 159–160; Marie-Thérèse d'Alverny, 'Introduction', in Alain de Lille, *Textes inédits*. Études de philosophie médiévale, 52 (Paris, 1965), pp. 156–162; Nikolaus M. Häring, 'Alain of Lille's *De fide Catholica* or *Contra haereticos*', *Analecta cisterciensia* 32 (1976) 216–237.

[225] Häring, 'Alain of Lille's *De fide Catholica* or *Contra haereticos*', pp. 228–229; see MPL 210, p. 337B: "Nunc ad secundum haereseos articulum transeamus" (cited by Häring, p. 229, note 44).

sion and for this reason was not mentioned, though it is implied in the words *communio sanctorum* of the Apostolic Creed.[226] Alain additionally mentioned a rather curious argument which was also recorded by other orthodox opponents. The Cathars argued that Christ, when he pronounced the words *Hoc est corpus meum*, pointed to his own body (*demonstrauerit seipsum*).[227] This reasoning reoccurred in a fifteenth-century Hussite text from the Low Countries, as well as (modified) in Hoen's *Epistola* and in a writing by Andreas Karlstadt. Furthermore, Alain gave their argument that mice eat the host, which therefore cannot be Christ's body.[228]

In sum, four Cathar arguments as recorded by their opponents are of relevance here; two of them had also been propounded by Berengar. They are:

1. When Christ spoke the words 'Hoc est corpus meum', he pointed to his own physical body.[229] Apart from Alain, the argument is mentioned by Ébrard of Béthune in his *Liber antiheresis* (ca. 1200), by the converted Cathar Ermengaud of Béziers in his *Contra hereticos* (ca. 1200–1220), by Moneta of Cremona in his *Aduersus Catharos et Valdenses libri quinque* (ca. 1241–1244) and in the *Disputatio inter Catholicum et paterinum haereticum* (ca. 1240–1250).[230]

---

[226] MPL 210, p. 363B–C: "Quaerunt etiam haeretici vtrum sit articulus fidei Christianae panem transsubstantiari in corpus Christi cum de hoc non fiat mentio in aliqua symbolo […] Dici tamen potest quod in Apostolico symbolo fiat mentio de eucharistia, cum dicitur *sanctorum communionem*. In hoc enim spiritualiter communificant sancti dum recipiunt corpus Christi, non solum sacramentaliter, sed etiam spiritualiter."

[227] MPL 210, p. 364D: "Praeterea, dicunt haeretici quod cum Christus ait, 'Accipite, hoc est corpus meum', non demonstrauerit corpus quod sub forma latebat in fine prolationis verborum, sed seipsum. Quasi dicat: 'Ego sum qui do; hoc est, corpus meum est quod vobis do, non hunc panem, et ideo dignius quam panis est quod do'."

[228] MPL 210, p. 359D: "Item, ponatur quod mus accedat ad pixidem in qua est Christi corpus; mus aliquid comedit, ergo aera, vel accidens, vel corpus Christi. Sed quod comedat aera vel accidens, absurdum est, et magis absurdum quod comedat corpus Christi."

[229] See Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period*, p. 58 (and p. 161, note 119).

[230] Ébrard of Béthune, *Liber antiheresis*, in Margarinus de la Bigne, *Maxima bibliotheca veterum patrum et antiquorum scriptorum ecclesiasticorum*, 27 vols. (Lyon, 1677), vol. XXIV, pp. 1525–1584, at p. 1547D: "Panem hunc dixit [Christus], ostendens panem, non manum pectori apponens, sicut vos mentimini" (in note: "Dicunt enim quod corpus suum et pectus ostendebat, cum diceret panem hunc"); Ermengaud de Béziers, *Contra hereticos*, MPL 204, pp. 1235–1272, at p. 1251D; Moneta of Cremona, *Aduersus Catharos et Valdenses libri quinque*, Thomas Augustinus Ricchinius, ed. (Rome, 1743; repr. Ridgewood, N.J., 1964), p. 296 ("Ad haec autem dixit haereticus aliquando, quod per

2. The doctrine of transubstantiation is not to be accepted as an article of faith, because it is not mentioned in any early Christian creed. This Cathar argument is only recorded by Alain. Wyclif and Hoen used the same argument.
3. The word 'est' in the phrase 'Hoc est corpus meum' requires a metaphorical interpretation; it should be read as 'Hoc significat corpus meum'.[231] This argument is recorded by Pierre of Poitiers in his *Sententiarum libri quinque* (ca. 1170–1175), by Innocent III in his *De sacra altaris mysterio* (ca. 1195), by Ermengaud of Béziers, by pseudo-Jacobo de Capellis in his *Summa contra hereticos* (ca. 1240), by Moneta of Cremona and by the *Disputatio inter Catholicum et paterinum haereticum*.[232]

---

pronomen *hoc* demonstrauerit Deus corpus proprium, intelligens sic: 'Accipite materialem panem et comedite eum', et postea tangens corpus suum dixit: *Hoc est corpus meum* etc."); *Disputatio inter Catholicum et paterinum haereticum* in Edmundus Martène and Ursinus Durand, edd., *Thesaurus nouus anecdotorum*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1717; repr. New York, 1968), vol. V, pp. 1704–1758, at p. 1731 ("Per hoc pronomen *hoc* demonstrauerit Dominus corpus suum proprium, intelligens sic: 'Accipite panem materialem et comedite', postea tangens corpus suum, dixit: *Hoc est corpus meum* etc."). The word 'paterinus' is an Italian nickname ('Patareni') documented from 1179 to denote the Cathars: Borst, *Die Katharer*, p. 250.

[231] See Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period*, p. 58 (and p. 161, note 121).

[232] Pierre of Poitiers, *Sententiarum libri quinque*, MPL 211, pp. 790–1280, at p. 1244C ("Alii dixunt, *Hoc est corpus meum*, id est *hoc*, scilicet panis iste, iam fiet corpus meum, id est, *hoc* significat corpus meum"); Innocent III, *De sacra altaris mysterio libri sex*, MPL 217, pp. 763–916, at pp. 860A ("Quod ergo panis fuerat cum accepit, corpus suum erat cum dedit. Panis itaque mutatus erat in corpus ipsius et similiter vinum in sanguinem. Non enim vt hareticos sapit, sed desipit, ita debet intelligi quod Dominus ait: *Hoc est corpus meum*, id est, hoc signat corpus meum, sicut quod dicit apostolus: *Petra autem erat Christus* [ICor 10,4], id est, petra significabat Christum") and 868D ("Nam si opponatur de sacerdote qui tunc consecrat cum illa verba pronuntiat, respondetur quod sacerdos nihil demonstrat cum illis verbis non utatur enuntiatiue sed recitatiue. Quemadmodum et Christus ait: *Ego sum vitis vera* [Io 15,5], *ego sum lux mundi* [Io 8,12], et innumera talia"); Ermengaud of Béziers, *Contra hereticos*, MPL 204, 1252D–1253C; pseudo-Jacobo de Capellis, *Summa contra hereticos* in Dino Bazzocchi, *L'eresia catara: Saggio storico filosofico con in appendice* Disputationes nonnullae aduersus haereticos, *codice inedito de seculo XIII della biblioteca Malatestina di Cesena* (Bologna, 1919–1920), appendix, p. cxlix ("Fabulantur autem [heretici—BJS] quoniam panis quem Christus in cena benedixit et fregit per significationem erat suum corpus et non per conversionem. Vnde sic exponunt 'hoc est corpus meum', id est, panis iste significat corpus meum. Sicuti dictum est petra erat Christus non re sed significatione"); Moneta of Cremona, *Aduersus Catharos et Valdenses libri quinque*, pp. 296 ("Alii autem aliter intelligunt illa verba Domini: *Hoc est corpus meum*, id est significat; sicut habetur I. Corinth. 10 v. 4: *Petra autem erat Christus*, id est, significabat Christum") and 302; *Disputatio inter Catholicum et paterinum haereticum*, p. 1731

4. Christ's body is in heaven, invulnerable; the host, on the contrary, is eaten by mice and hence cannot be the body of Christ.[233] The question *Quid sumit mus?* became commonplace in early scholastic treatises.[234] In treatises against the heretics it is mentioned (other than by Alain) by Guitmund of Aversa, refuting Berengar, in his *De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate in eucharistia* (ca. 1073–1075), by Alger of Liège in his *De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Dominici* (ca. 1110–1115), by Innocent III, by Ébrard of Béthune and by the Waldensian Durandus of Huesca, who in the late 1180s or early 1190s composed his *Liber antiheresis* as a work designed to combat the Cathars.[235]

This preliminary assessment of the historical background of Hoen's specific arguments needs some refining. These references to Cathar arguments are not intended to suggest that Hoen's treatise is characteristically Cathar; Hoen is separated from these medieval heretics by

---

("Illa verba accipiuntur significatiue, vnde *Hoc est corpus meum*, id est, significat corpus meum, sicut illud *Petra autem erat Christus*, id est figurat Christum").

A partial English translation of the text by pseudo-Jacobo de Capellis can be found in Walter L. Wakefield and Austin P. Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* (New York–London, 1969), pp. 301–306; Alastair Duke, 'The Origins of Evangelical Dissent in the Low Countries', in Duke, pp. 1–28, at p. 20 (note 95) referred to it. On the alleged authorship of Jacobo de Capellis, see Mirella Ferrari, 'Per una storia delle bibliotece francescane a Milano nel Medioevo e nell'Umanesimo', *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 72 (1979) 429–464, at pp. 438–441.

[233] See Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period*, p. 58 (and p. 161, note 120); Macy, 'Of Mice and Manna: Quid Mus Sumit as a Pastoral Question'.

[234] See Artur Michael Landgraf, *Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik*, 4 vols. in 6 (Regensburg, 1952–1956), vol. III/2, pp. 207–222.

[235] Guitmund of Aversa, *De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate in eucharistia*, MPL 149, pp. 1427–1494, at pp. 1445C ("Berengarius dicit: 'Caro Christi incorruptibilis est, sacramenta vero altaris, si diutius serventur, possunt corrumpi, videntur enim putrefieri'") and 1448C ("A muribus quoque vel huiuscemodi quibuslibet animalibus corrodi vel consumi haec sacramenta posse obiiciunt"); Alger of Liège, *De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Dominici libri tres*, MPL 180, pp. 743–854, at p. 811D ("opponunt haeretici ad tanti sacramenti indignitatem, quod panis et vinum in sacramento mucidum vel putridum fiat, panis a muribus corrodatur et in ventre eorum inueniatur, ignibus etiam comburatur"); Innocent III, MPL 217, 863A ("Quid etiam a mure comeditur cum sacramentum corroditur"); Ébrard of Béthune in La Bigne XXIV, p. 1548C–D; Kurt-Victor Selge, *Die ersten Waldenser, mit Edition des Liber antiheresis des Durandus von Osca*, 2 vols. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, 37/I and 37/II (Berlin, 1967), vol. II: *Der Liber antiheresis des Durandus von Osca*, p. 52 ("Sed hereticus forte dicit aliquis: Non est credendum, nam ostiam illam bene comedit mus aut canis vel porcus, si inueniunt, aut adulter vel homicida bene comedit ostiam illam").

the wide gulf of their belief that creation is evil and that bread and wine therefore cannot be Christ's body and blood.[236] Neither is there a continuous line of development from Wyclif's and Hus's beliefs to Hoen's. Upon closer examination, it appears that Hoen modified the direction of these arguments. He used the same arguments, but in a different, more radical context. Hus never adhered to the doctrine of 'remanentia'; he did not teach that after the consecration the eucharistic bread and wine remained mere bread and wine. He used Mt 24,23 to attack the popular faith in miracles that interpreted a red-coloured host as proof of Christ's physical presence and adored it as such. In his *quaestio* Hus argued that Christ with his glorified blood was at the Father's right hand in heaven, but added that *de potencia ordinata* Christ was really and truly present in the sacrament of the Eucharist.[237] Wyclif employed the arguments mentioned to combat the doctrine of 'annihilation' but, like Berengar, he did not deny Christ's real presence on the altar: after the consecration the eucharistic bread was a combination of two quiddities, just as Christ was at once God and man.[238]

Hoen's use of their arguments in a different context, however, is not without precedent. After their deaths, the opinions of Wyclif and Hus were disseminated and popularized on a grand scale and generally their arguments were given without their cautious formulations. Often they were advanced in support of a merely symbolic interpretation.

Lollards in England circulated many texts which were produced in clandestine scriptoria and distributed via secret networks.[239] One of these texts is a cycle of 294 English sermons completely covering the ecclesiastical year, in which Wyclif's works have been elaborated. (Early critics even ascribed the cycle to Wyclif himself, but this now seems unlikely.) The cycle dates from the late fourteenth century. In the sermon for the Sunday within the octave of Epiphany the author discusses the descent of the Holy Spirit in the figure of a dove (Io 1,29–34) and

---

[236] See Borst, *Die Katharer*, p. 207, note 14, for references to the Cathar belief that the eucharistic bread forms part of an evil creation.

[237] On Hus's views, see Amedeo Molnár, 'Les réponses de Jean Huss aux quarante-cinq articles', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 31 (1964) 85–99, and Stanislav Sousedík, 'Huss et la doctrine eucharistique "rémanentiste"', *Divinitas* 3 (1977) 383–407.

[238] See Anne Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, pp. 283, 284: "The complexity of Wyclif's view, and of the arguments he used to support it, makes it hardly surprising that his followers often simplified its subtlety and sometimes modified its direction […] Some Lollards simplified Wyclif's view to a straightforward memorial interpretation of the sacrament."

[239] See Anne Hudson, *The Premature Reformation*, pp. 281–290.

considers in what sense the dove *was* the Holy Spirit. This question is treated by means of two analogies: in Gen 41 it is said that the seven oxen occurring in Joseph's dream *are* seven years and in ICor 11 it is likewise stated that the holy bread *is* 'verreyly Godes body'. Following Wyclif, the author writes that there are two modes of predication, personal and habitudinal; according to habitudinal predication (that is, "by an established convention of speech") the dove "signefieth" God—just as smoke "signefieth" fire and just as Paul wrote that after the day of resurrection Christ would "be" all in all.[240] The argument of a mouse eating a consecrated host also figures in this cycle in the sermon *In festo corporis Christi*, which uses Christ's words "Caro enim mea vera est cibus" (John 6,56) to criticize the predominant ideas surrounding the feast of Corpus Christi.[241] Denying the presence of Christ's body and blood on the altar and emphasizing the necessity of spiritual participation, the author ridicules the belief in Christ's physical presence with the argument that a mouse cannot chew Christ's body.[242] While Wyclif's view of predication and its application to eucharistic doctrine was frequently opposed by his antagonists,[243] his convictions were

---

[240] *English Wycliffite Sermons* I, Anne Hudson, ed. (Oxford, 1983), pp. 345–349, at p. 347.48–53; together with a detailed commentary the sermon was also edited in *Selections from English Wycliffite Writings*, Anne Hudson, ed. (Cambridge, 1978), pp. 113–115 and pp. 192–194. As the background of this sermon Dr. Hudson indicates Wyclif's *Trialogus*, pp. 266–267 and *De apostasia*, pp. 232–233 (*Selections from English Wycliffite Writings*, pp. 193–194); in addition I would suggest considering *De apostasia*, pp. 110, 116 as well, as there the comparison with Paul's saying that Christ will "be" all in all is also mentioned.

[241] The feast of Corpus Christi was founded in Liège in the mid-thirteenth century, spread all over Europe and was officially recognized in 1317. See *Studia eucharistica DCCi anni a condito festo sanctissimi corporis Christi* (Antwerp, 1946) and Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge, 1991), who in great detail describes all facets surrounding the feast.

[242] *English Wycliffite Sermons* III, Anne Hudson, ed. (Oxford, 1990), pp. 247–248, at p. 248; the sermon is also discussed by Rubin, *Corpus Christi*, pp. 225–226.

[243] The Franciscan theologian William Woodford (ca. 1330–ca. 1397), Wyclif's chief contemporary opponent, in response to Wyclif's view on figurative speech referred to St Augustine's hermeneutical principle that the context should determine whether a text should be interpreted literally or figuratively. The text 'I am the true vine' (Io 15,5) in Woodford's opinion could not be compared with the text 'This is my body' as an entity which 'is' figuratively is not 'realiter'. See Woodford's *Quaestiones LXXII de sacramento altaris*, MS Bodley 703, ff. 102–183, at f. 131. On Woodford, see J.I. Catto, *William Woodford O.F.M. (ca. 1330–ca. 1397)* (unpublished D. Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1969; Bodley: Ms. D. Phil. d. 4877).

Another of Wyclif's opponents, Thomas Netter of Walden, attacked Wyclif's view in his *Doctrinale antiquitatum fidei Catholicae ecclesiae* V,86 (ed. Blanciotti, II, pp. 512–518).

widely disseminated—even reaching the lowest strata of lay society—and usually appeared in defence of a strictly symbolic interpretation of the Eucharist. From his interrogation of 1520, it becomes apparent that a certain John Harris of Upton (Berkshire) used the argument of the seven oxen,[244] while the same interpretation is aired in *Wyclyffes Wycket*.[245]

A similar development took place in Bohemia where, after Hus's death, the Hussite movement disintegrated into moderate (Utraquist) and radical (Taborite) groups.[246] One of the Taborite bishops, Nicholas of Pilgram ("Biskupec", ca. 1385 – ca. 1460), accused by the Utraquist

---

On Thomas Netter of Walden, see Michael Hurly, 'A Pre-Tridentine Theology of Tradition: Thomas Netter of Walden (d. 1430)', *The Heythrop Journal* 4 (1963) 348–366, and Margaret Harvey, 'The Diffusion of the *Doctrinale* of Thomas of Walden in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries', in Lesley Smith and Benedicta Ward, edd., *Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Margaret Gibson* (London, 1992), pp. 100–112. On Woodford and Thomas Netter as protagonists of Wyclif, see Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, pp. 49–55.

[244] See Hudson, *Premature Reformation*, pp. 5, 288, 289.

[245] *Wycklyffes Wycket, which he made in Kyng Rychards days the second in the yere of our lorde God a. M.LLL.XLV* (Norenburch [= London?], 1546), B2verso: "Also Christ sayeth, John XV: 'I am a very vine', wherfore worshyppe ye not the vyne for God as ye do the breade, where in was Christ a very vine, or where in was the breade Christes bodye in figurative speche, whych is hyd to the understanding of sinners" (Oxford, Bodleian Library, sign.: 80 S 221 [5] Th). Just like Wyclif (see *supra*, note 167), the author believes the prediction of the "abhominacyon of desolacyon" to be fulfilled in his own days with the current "heresy of the host": "who maye se a greater abhomynacyons then to se to be led awaye frome God and they be taughte to worshyp for God that thing that is not God nor sauviour of the world" (A3recto). Referring to Act 17,24, the author states his belief that God does not dwell in temples made with hands (A3verso) and typifies the doctrine of transubstantiation as "the moste falsest belef […] taughte in a false law that they have made upon the secret hooste" (A4verso): the apostles never ordered the veneration of the host, man cannot create his Creator (that is, he cannot make the body and blood of Christ out of a piece of bread) and Christ at the Last Supper did not bless the bread (he only took it) but his disciples, in whom he laid the bread of life (A4verso–A5recto). He also asks with which words Christ is actually supposed to have changed the bread into his body and in which person the priest pronounces the formula of consecration, adding that "the breade is the fygure or mynde of Christes bodye in earth, and therfore Christe sayde: 'As oft as ye do thys thynge, do it in mynde of me'" (A6recto–A6verso). On the character and bibliographical information about this treatise, see Anne Hudson, '"No Newe Thyng": The Printing of Medieval Texts in the Early Reformation Period', in Anne Hudson, *Lollards and their books* (London–Ronceverte, 1985), pp. 227–248, at pp. 231–232 and 246–247 (the text certainly dates from before 1518 and in all probability is much older).

[246] See Howard Kaminsky, *A History of the Hussite Revolution* (Berkeley, 1967), which ends in 1424, and F.M. Bartos, *The Hussite Revolution, 1424–1437* (Boulder–New York, 1986).

theologian Peter Chelcicky of denying Christ's real presence on the altar, similarly argued that the eucharistic bread "is" in the same manner Christ's body as John the Baptist "is" Elia and Christ the rock. In these cases "is" should be interpreted as "signifies" ("significat").[247]

These developments reflect an important transition in late medieval culture. The increasing literacy of lay people made vernacular theological texts more readily accessible to them—and those still illiterate often had texts read to them—which made the popularization of heretical or nonconformist ideas possible and occasioned their function in a context more radical than the original one. Written literature played an important role in the spread of heretical movements, as literacy and heresy interacted closely.[248] These changes also occurred in the Netherlands, where the high level of urbanization led to a correspondingly high standard of literacy.[249] A description of heretical groups and ideas in the fifteenth-century Low Countries yields a sure indication of the more exact historical background of Hoen's treatise, giving an answer to the final problem of this chapter: How did the arguments discussed here reach Hoen?

---

[247] See Jaroslav Goll, *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Böhmischen Brüder*, 2 vols. (Prague, 1878–1882), II: *Peter Chelcicky und seine Lehre*, pp. 62,64. For more instances, see Joseph Müller, *Die deutschen Katechismen der Böhmischen Brüder*. Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica, 6 (Berlin, 1887; repr. Nieuwkoop, 1970), pp. 117–136 and Erhard Peschke, *Die Theologie der Böhmischen Brüder in ihrer Frühzeit* I/1 (Stuttgart, 1935), pp. 79–104 and 118–123. On Bohemian dissent in the early fourteenth century, see Alexander Patschovsky, *Die Anfänge einer ständigen Inquisition in Böhmen: Ein Prager Inquisitore-Handbuch aus der ersten Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts*. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters, 3 (Berlin–New York, 1975); see esp. pp. 41, 74 (note 279), 90, 105, 187 for dissenting views on the Eucharist.

[248] On this subject, see Herbert Grundmann, 'Litteratus-illiteratus: Der Wandel einer Bildungsnorm vom Altertum zum Mittelalter', in Grundmann, *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, 3 vols. Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 25/1–25/3 (Stuttgart, 1976–1978), vol. III: *Bildung und Sprache*, pp. 1–66; M.T. Clanchy, *From Memory to Written Record: England, 1066–1307* (London, 1979), which concentrates on the establishment of literate habits in England in the formative period from the Norman conquest to the death of Edward I; Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton, 1983), pp. 92–151 and 241–325; Margaret Aston, 'Lollardy and Literacy', in Aston, *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval Religion* (London–Ronceverte, 1984), pp. 193–217; and especially Peter Biller and Anne Hudson, edd., *Heresy and Literacy, 1000–1530*. Cambridge Sudies in Medieval Literature, 23 (Cambridge, 1994).

[249] See Alain Derville, 'L'alphabétisation du peuple à la fin du Moyen Age', *Revue du Nord* 66 (1984) 761–775.

D. Les faulx hérites Praguois *in the fifteenth-century Low Countries*

Although Pope Martin V's call for a crusade against the schismatic Bohemians in 1420 met some response from a number of cities in the county of Holland,[250] the heretical ideas of Wyclif and Hus exercised considerable influence in the Burgundian Netherlands during the entire fifteenth century, in particular in the important provinces of Hainault and Flanders (where, until 1430, the magistrates were preoccupied with them). The available sources, however rare and fragmentary, permit the reconstruction of an important underground current of dissent, stamped by the ideas of Wyclif and Hus.[251] These dissidents were not just scattered individuals; they organized themselves in groups and held meetings, presided over by literate leaders. Within these groups writings in Latin or in the vernacular were circulated which they read themselves or had read to them. In addition, they proselytized actively. Two of the treatises this dissenting movement produced have survived and contain specific arguments against the doctrine of transubstantiation and the *presentia realis* which reoccur in Hoen's *Epistola*.[252]

---

[250] Fifty-six individuals from Dordrecht, 208 from Delft and a group of people from Leiden joined the papal and imperial armies against Jan Zizka and his Hussite armies; see Marcus Zuerius of Boxhorn, *Nederlantsche historie. Eerste boeck, behelsende de eerste veranderingen in de godsdienst ende leere, neffen de harde vervolgingen daer over ontstaen in de Nederlanden, voor ende tot de tijden van keizer Karel de Viifde* (Leiden, 1644), p. 155 (Boxhorn adds, however, that many crusaders in Bohemia learned to know the Hussite ideas, became convinced that these ideas were the truth and propagated them in their fatherland once they were back); D.P. Oosterbaan, *De Oude Kerk te Delft gedurende de Middeleeuwen* (The Hague, 1973), p. 289; M.E.H.N. Mout, *Bohemen en de Nederlanden in de zestiende eeuw* (Leiden, 1975), p. 14. And see *supra*, p. 45.

[251] For a survey of the historiography on the subject, see B.J. Spruyt, 'Das Echo des Jan Hus und der hussitischen Bewegung in den burgundischen Niederlanden, ca. 1420–ca. 1520', in F. Seibt, ed., 'Jan Hus—zwischen Zeiten, Völkern, Konfessionen' (München, 1997), pp. 283–301.

[252] The period 1418–1430 has been described in detail (though not exhaustively) by Frantisek M. Bartos, 'Picards et "Pikarti"', *Bulletin [de la] société de l'histoire du protestantisme français* 80 (1931) 465–486 and 81 (1932) 8–28. See also, however, Paul Beuzart, *Les hérésies pendant le Moyen Age et la Réforme jusqu'en la mort de Philippe II, 1598, dans la région de Douai, d'Arras et au pays de l'Alleu* (Le Puy, 1912), pp. 37–101; Ernst Werner, *Nachrichten über spätmittelalterliche Ketzer aus tsechoslovakischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* (Leipzig, 1963), pp. 251–264 and 277–279; Hermann Heimpel, ed., *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren aus dem Jahre 1425: Akten der Prozesse gegen die deutschen Hussiten Johannes Drändorf und Peter Turnau sowie gegen Drändorfs Diener Martin Borchard.* Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, 24 (Göttingen, 1969), pp. 99–100 (on these heretics, see also Kurt-Victor Selge, 'Heidelberger Ketzerprozesse in der Frühzeit der hussitischen Revolution', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 82 [1971] 167–202). After the completion of Paul

Even before the Council of Constance—during which Jan Hus was burned at the stake on 6 July 1415—the inquisitor Pierre Floure was active in Tournai. In July of 1411, together with Thomas Vivart, doctor of theology, and several episcopal judges, Floure informed the city magistrates of the presence of heretics in their town. They were then arrested. One month later he preached in public on "le fait de la foy et des yreges". In 1412 more suspects were found in Tournai and three years later people from Lille were also tried. Though the city council of Lille asked him to proceed "doucement", in 1417 Floure gave another public sermon in the market square of Tournai, after which three people were burned. The previous year, on 3 February 1416, Pierre du Pret, a weaver from Tournai, had already been condemned to the stake. In all of these cases the documents speak of "personnes qui estoient souspechonnees s'estre bourge et incredule" without further specifying the nature of their heretical ideas. But a Hussite text from 1423 men-

---

Fredericq's *Corpus documentorum inquisitionis* (Fredericq) and the *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica* (BRN) by F. Pijper and S. Cramer, Bartos discovered two fifteenth-century Hussite texts, both originating from the Low Countries. In 1923 he found a Hussite manifesto, written under the pseudonym of *Puer bohemus*, in the Staatsbibliothek of Karlsruhe, and edited this precious source in the 'Mémoires de la société des sciences de Bohême': 'Puer Bohemus: Dva projevy husitské propagandy', *Vestnik královske Ceské spolecnosti nauk* 1923 (Prague, 1924), pp. 1–58. In 1932 Bartos published the beginning of *Puer bohemus*, which was lacking in the Karlsruhe copy, from another copy that he had found in Stuttgart; see 'Husitika a bohemika nekolika knihoven nemeckych a svycarskych', *Vestnik královske Ceské spolecnosti nauk* 1931 (Prague, 1932), pp. 88–90. After he had been shown the right place where this text had to be located by Augustin Neumann (*Francouzká Hussitica.* Studie a texty k nábozenskym dejinám Ceskym III,2–4 [Olmütz, 1923]; see Bartos, 'Puer Bohemus', p. 58), Bartos published in 1931–1932 his article 'Picards et "Pikarti"' and announced the publication of a second document, written by Gilles Mersault from Tournai, which he published in 1933: 'Manifesta mesta Prahy z doby husitské', *Sbornik prispevku k dejinám hlavniho mesta Prahy* 7 (1933) 253–309 and 473–474.

Though these studies by Bartos were innovative and remain highly valuable, his description of the radical followers of Hus as "Picards" (identified with the sect of *homines intelligentiae* or *liberi spiritus*) is open to debate. Howard Kaminsky, *A History of the Hussite Revolution*, p. 357, found no "characteristic traits of the brothers and sisters of the Free Spirit" in *Puer bohemus*, nor in the manifesto by Mersault (see also Robert E. Lerner, *The Heresy of the Free Spirit in the Later Middle Ages* [Berkeley, 1972], pp. 119–124). On the other hand, Kaminsky found the doctrines of the radical wing of the Hussite movement, the Taborites, "faithfully reflected" in both texts and suggested that *Puer bohemus* was also written by Mersault (as did Jean Gonnet and Amedeo Molnár, *Les Vaudois au Moyen Age* [Torino, 1978], p. 258, note 218). Although no definite proof for this identification exists, the argument is quite persuasive; in any case, we can accept that *Puer bohemus* as well as Gilles Mersault were radical followers of Hus from the Low Countries.

tions that Pierre du Pret died for truths that had been formulated and defended in Bohemia; this suggests that the entire group was composed of followers of Hus.[253]

About this time the *clericus coniugatus* Jean of Hiellin was active in the bishopric of Tournai as the spiritual leader of a sizable group of heretics. During a long period of more than fifteen years, he instructed men and women, children and adolescents in heretical doctrines, reading to them from "libri in vulgari Gallico scripti" and explaining the "hereses et opinions" these books contained. When the sect was discovered, several of them were taken prisoner and some were burned at the stake, and Jean left the bishopric with the intent of settling in Bohemia among the Hussites whose views agreed "in multis cum opinionibus quas ipse tenebat". He never reached the land of Hus, but he held on to his ideas for more than fifteen years. He was repeatedly summoned before the inquisitor and the bishop and was eventually excommunicated in absentia. In 1430 Jean's name appeared in an order of Duke Philip of Burgundy which demanded that the magistrates of his provinces arrest and deliver to the Inquisition twenty fugitive members of "la secte dampnable et perverse desdits Praguois". Shortly afterwards Jean changed his mind and addressed himself to the pope (Eugene IV) to be received into the grace of the church and to have his excommunication lifted. In a letter of 22 April 1431 to Cardinal John, the pope ordered that he be absolved after abjuration, penance and punishment.[254]

Before 1418, John of Alkmaar, a cleric from the bishopric of Utrecht who in all probability was a bachelor of arts from the University of Prague, composed a treatise with thirty theses borrowed from Wyclif. He argued that all ecclesiastical property should be taken from the clergy because wordly concerns impeded the fulfilment of their spiritual duties. He sent copies of his theses to Emperor Sigismund and King Henry V of England, urging them to confiscate all ecclesiastical property. In April 1418, at the Council of Constance, he abjured his theses as well as those of Wyclif and Hus and promised to send his recantation to the king of England and also to the magistrates of Alkmaar, the town of his birth.[255]

---

[253] Fredericq I, pp. 279–282; II, p. 198; III, pp. 49–51; Bartos, 'Manifesta mesta Prahy', p. 301, and Bartos, 'Picards et "Pikarti"', p. 471, note 20.

[254] Fredericq III, pp. 80–82; I, pp. 312–314 (313).

[255] Fredericq I, p. 297; III, pp. 51–55; W. Moll, 'Johannes van Alkmaar voor het

Nicolas Serrurier, an Augustinian hermit and doctor of theology from Tournai, was another prominent leader. His trial lasted from 1418 to 1424. About 1415 Nicolas and two other monks had volunteered to preach in the bishoprics of Cambrai, Artois, Tournai and Terwaan (Thérouanne) against "quidam homines segregantes se a consortio hominum et in siluis, memoribus et cauernis et in locis absconsis et abditis sua faciebant conuenticula". During his activities against these groups he was himself won over to their convictions; not only did he begin to proclaim these opinions publicly, but he also put them in writing and translated them into French for the benefit of the people. After he had been examined by the bishop of Tournai, Jan of Thoisy, and by the inquisitor Pierre Floure, he contritely signed a notarial act at the Council of Constance on 12 April 1418. Serrurier solemnly recanted a list of thirty-one heresies as well as those of Wyclif and Hus "cum quibus aliqui ex predictis articulis connexionem et dependentiam habere noscuntur". One of the Hussite tracts still to be discussed gratefully recalled his preaching.[256]

In the spring of 1420 a group of eighteen people was arrested in Douai and Artois. They were led by Jan Fierini, in whose house they met to listen to his sermons and to read heretical books. These followers of "ladicte heresie des Pragoys" ("qui sectam et opiniones tenebant Boemorum") had been denounced and the magistrate of Douai turned them over to Martin Poree, bishop of Artois. Two of them were found innocent and set free, nine were condemned to jail and seven were burned. Catherine Mainard, one of the four women of the group, proved the most intractable. She encouraged the others to endure their suffering, which lasted for two hours, and to die as true martyrs. She showed no contrition and strangled herself with her chains before the fire reached her.[257]

Out of all these cases that of Gilles Mersault stands apart. In 1415 he was admitted as a citizen of Tournai. There he acted as a clerk

---

kerkgericht der kerkvergadering van Constanz', *Studiën en bijdragen op 't gebied der historische theologie* 3 (1876) 1–25, and R.R. Post, *Kerkgeschiedenis van Nederland in de Middeleeuwen*, 2 vols. (Utrecht–Antwerp, 1957), II, pp. 346–347.

[256] Fredericq II, pp. 204–216, 229–237, 237–242, 243–247, 252–261; see also A. Cauchie, 'Nicole Serrurier, hérétique du XVe siècle', *Annalectes pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique de la Belgique* 24 (1893) 241–336, and see Bartos, 'Picards et "Pikarti"', p. 482 (note 43) and Bartos, 'Manifesta mesta Prahy', p. 301.

[257] Fredericq I, pp. 299–303; III, pp. 56–63 and 109–111.

to the guild of lacemakers, and in 1420 he bought a house.[258] During Christmas of that year he attached a number of texts to the wall of the church of St Quentin attacking the institution of the church.[259] He then fled the city and went to Bohemia, but in 1423 he was back in Tournai to "correct" the population that had been "duped" into contributing large sums of money to a crusade against the Bohemians. During the night of 10 March 1423 he secretly distributed heretical tracts ("cedulles, rolles et quoyers de l'heresie que ceulx de Peraghe et de Behagne tenoient contre le foy chrestienne"). At the end of the manifesto which has come down to us, Mersault expressed the wish to be permitted to defend his theses in the market square from a scaffold.[260] He was denounced, however, and locked up in the bishop's jail. In June, a certain Jacquemart de Bléharies, alleging that he spoke on behalf of the deans of the guilds, demanded that Mersault be set free. As the guilds had shortly before rebelled against infractions of the privileges they had received in 1336–1337, the city council, in fear of "le fureur du people", granted this demand. When several hours later Bléharies's deception was uncovered, Mersault was arrested again. He expected the destruction of the beast of the Apocalypse to come soon, but his defeat followed instead: on 22 July 1423 he was burned outside the city walls.[261]

Mersault's manifesto was a defence and explanation of the Four Prague Articles that had been issued by the different groups of Hussites in April/May 1420 when they were threatened by Sigismund's anti-Hussite measures and by Pope Martin V's call for a crusade against the Bohemian heretics. Their articles demanded: 1. freedom for laymen as well as for clergy to preach the word of God; 2. punishment of mortal sins; 3. abolition of the church's temporal power and the clergy's return to the *vita apostolica*; 4. communion *sub vtraque specie*.[262] Mersault defended these articles passionately. In Prague and Bohemia, he wrote, the truth is openly declared and everyone is permitted to have a Bible

[258] Bartos, 'Picards et "Pikarti"', p. 475, note 26.

[259] Bartos, 'Manifesta mesta Prahy', pp. 290–291.

[260] Bartos, 'Manifesta mesta Prahy', p. 302.

[261] Fredericq II, pp. 247–248 and 304–308; III, pp. 63–65 and 67–72. The Sorbonne approved the bishop's conviction of Mersault; see P. Féret, *La faculté de théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres. Moyen Age* IV (Paris, 1897), pp. 104–105. In December 1429, Bléharies suffered the same fate as Mersault: see Fredericq II, pp. 262–263 and 308–309; I, pp. 310–311.

[262] Frederick G. Heymann, *John Zizka and the Hussite Revolution* (Princeton, 1955), pp. 148–163; Kaminsky, *A History of the Hussite Revolution*, pp. 369–375.

in the vernacular, but in our fatherland this is prohibited by the clergy. He also added that because in Bohemia all sins were punished one could not find brothels or whores, nor useless games there; the population sang spiritual songs, not worldly ones. Mersault considered the way of life of the contemporary clergy to be in flagrant conflict with the commands of Christ and the apostles. The clergy live like wealthy princes and are anything but *discipuli Christi*, he said; they are "disciples of the devil and antichrists, that is they are against Christ". According to Mersault two texts from II Thess. 2 showed that the pope was the antichrist whose coming was accompanied by the works of Satan: through miracles, signs and powers the people were deceived. Christ and the apostle Paul expressly commanded the celebration of the sacrament *sub duplici specie, scilicet sub specie pani et vini*, but now the miserable flock received communion only *sub vna specie*. Thus they were led to eternal death by the pope and his ilk.

Mersault next sums up the Ten Commandments, because without their observance one cannot obtain eternal life. With the aid of these commandments and many biblical texts he rejects the worship of images. He labels current practices *fornicatio spiritualis* that govern the entire world, including the so-called Christian world. He concludes that the church of his day is nothing more than Babylon, in which the prophecies of the antichrist are fulfilled. Consequently the fall of the beast is also near. The entire world is drunk with the wine of the whore, and Mersault exhorts his fellow townsmen to flee this Babylon.

The Mass, so Mersault goes on, is a human invention. Can the clergy find evidence that Christ ever celebrated the Mass (*missam cantauit*)? The Bible teaches only that Christ instituted the sacrament of bread and wine on the night on which he was betrayed. Dedicating Masses to the dead is contrary to the Bible, which teaches that people will be judged by their own works. There are only two ways (heaven and hell) and there is only one advocate (Christ). All other advocates (the saints) were invented to squeeze money out of the pockets of the people. One must not be deceived by the miracles of priests, for the power to do miracles and bring forth signs they receive from the devil. Only God, not the pope, must be venerated. Mersault finally parries the call for a papal and imperial crusade against Bohemia with an exhortation to an armed struggle against Babylon. The notion of a nearly complete and confusing satanical seduction by priests and other clergy in the last days, already apparent in Hus's *De sanguine Christi*, connects Mersault's manifesto with Hoen's treatise.

In this atmosphere a second treatise, *Puer bohemus*, was written, perhaps also by Mersault, reflecting the same current of thought. It sought to unmask the "Roman heresy".[263] In his opposition to the doctrine of transubstantiation the author uses arguments that also occur later in Hoen's *Epistola*. He demonstrates that the eucharistic bread remains bread even after consecration and is neither Christ, nor "really Christ's body". The bread is *creatura, non creator*, and for that reason it must not be venerated. The words 'hoc est corpus meum' are to be understood 'participatiue' (that is, 'misterialiter', 'communicatiue' or 'spiritualiter') because Paul wrote that the bread which we eat is a *participatio corporis Domini* and the cup of the Supper is a *communicatio sanguinis Christi* (ICor 10,16).[264] The Bible often speaks in a similar non-literal manner and in Io 6 Christ maintained this spiritual interpretation of his words against the carnal opinion of his antagonists who called this pronouncement 'hard'.[265] The author cites as examples of non-literal usage Is 41,23 ("ego dixi: dii estis") and Ps 21,17 ("ego sum vermis et non homo")—texts in which some form of the verb 'esse' is used but which requires a non-literal interpretation. When Christ called Judas *dyabolus*, he did not mean that Judas was *dyabolus* but that he was *dyabolicus*.[266] Similarly, when Christ spoke the words *hoc est corpus meum* while indicating the bread he was actually referring to himself and said *demonstrans*: "hic est panis". This argument, which we have already seen propounded by the Cathars (see p. 144), reoccurs in Hoen's *Epistola* with the modification that Hoen applied it to the figurative explanation of Mt 16,18 ('supra hanc petram'), words which Christ also spoke *se demonstrans*.[267] Although Christ and his disciples, according to *Puer Bohemus*, simply called the bread 'bread', it is now called his body, for

[263] Bartos, 'Manifesta mesta Prahy', p. 41.

[264] Bartos, 'Puer Bohemus', pp. 23–24.

[265] Bartos, 'Puer Bohemus', p. 27; p. 26: "in consimilibus loquendi modis, quibus Scriptura plena est"; and see Hoen, Ep. 232.30–31 and 232.34: "Et similibus locutionibus plena est Scriptura […] et similia abundant exempla."

[266] Bartos, 'Puer Bohemus', p. 26.

[267] Bartos, 'Puer Bohemus', pp. 26–27: "Ita eciam hic, quando panem demonstrans dicit: 'hoc est corpus meum', quia realem vel litteralem non habet veritatem, vt ostensum est, ideo spiritualiter intelligendum est […]. Christus, qui demonstrans dicit: 'hic est panis', sed numquid tunc materialis panis efficitur aut in materialem panem convertebatur, quando id de se ipso loquebatur". Ep. 228.15–16: "[Sed mirum, quare non similiter dicant] Christum in petram transsubstantiatum, cum se demonstrans ait: 'Supra hanc petram'."

which there is no scriptural foundation whatsoever.[268] The sacrament of the altar must be understood as a *memorialis institucio* and the bread as *spiritualiter memoriale Christi*.[269] Like Hoen later, the author supports his arguments by comparing the eucharistic bread with the manna the fathers ate in the desert. There is no essential difference between the two: the patriarchs in the desert ate the same spiritual food (Christ) as the New Testament believers, although Christ was only promised to the former and had already appeared to the latter.[270] This argument is followed by a reference (also found in Hoen's treatise) to Paul's comparison between the sacrament and sacrifices to idols. Those who ate these sacrifices were *participes ydolorum*, just as those who eat the eucharistic bread are *participes corporis Christi*.[271] Paul, the author continues, did not talk about the cup "that we transform or convert" but about the cup "that we bless" and the Gospels do not say that Christ changed the bread but that he blessed it. The "Roman heresy" which holds that the bread and wine are present in the sacrament *sub accidentibus* is therefore manifestly incorrect, unlike the teaching of the Bohemians, who say that Christ "sub vero pane et vino […] nobis memoriam suam relinquerit et se ipsum nobis spiritualiter communicat, panem et vinum non realiter mutans, sed misterialiter consecrans".[272] The entire "faith of the Romanists" must be rejected because it is nothing more than a diabolical addition to the "apostolical faith".[273] Christ's body is exalted and thus not subject to corruption or mutation and the doctrine of transubstantiation is in flagrant contradiction to this plain concept.[274] Nor can one dismiss these objections by asserting that the mutation of the bread into the body of Christ is something miraculous which one must accept on faith. Faith is indeed "above reason", but it is not without authority

[268] Bartos, 'Puer Bohemus', pp. 24–25, and see Ep. 226.28 – 227.2: "Huius tamen viuacissimae fidei scholastici romani non meminerunt, sed aliam quandam mortuam diligenter docuisse putabant esse satis, cum dicerent panis post consecrationem verum Christi corpus esse, et de modo quo hoc fiat, multa subtilia, nullis Scriptura probate", and Ep. 227.19–21: "Neque apostoli de hoc sacramento ita locuti sunt; panem fregerunt, panem appellauerunt, et de hac fide romana tacuerunt omnes".

[269] Bartos, 'Puer Bohemus', p. 25.

[270] Bartos, 'Puer Bohemus', pp. 27–28 (*vtrumque Christus per significationem, neutrum per substanciam*); Ep. 229.1–28.

[271] Bartos, 'Puer Bohemus', p. 29; Ep. 227.22–26.

[272] Bartos, 'Puer Bohemus', pp. 29–30.

[273] Bartos, 'Puer Bohemus', p. 30; Ep. 231.27 – 232.15.

[274] Bartos, 'Puer Bohemus', p. 31; Ep. 229.36 – 230.3.

and such miracles are nowhere mentioned in Scripture.[275] All this leads to the conclusion that the Roman church is filled with errors, sects and heresies and thus she is not holy but a violator of the holy, not a mother but a whore. According to Paul (ITim 4,1–2 and 7) one must flee from her.[276]

In the year after Mersault's execution five more people were burned in Douai.[277] In the same year the German Hussite Johannes of Drändorf (a priest later burned at the stake in Heidelberg in 1425, aged 34) was active in the Netherlands. Drändorf studied in Prague, was ordained a priest and worked as a wandering preacher, first in southern Bohemia, then in Basel, from where he travelled down the Rhine. In the early summer of 1424 he was in Brabant, where he preached to 'beghards' and—according to his *famulus* Martin Borchard—converted many of them. He lived the *vita apostolica*, refuted swearing oaths, and in general his convictions showed a mixture of Waldensian, Wycliffite and Hussite ideas. His activities thus helped spread these ideas in the Netherlands as well.[278]

In 1426 the magistrate of Douai handed Jacquemart le Phlon over to the Inquisition.[279] The next year the bishop of Cambrai examined and jailed Jacquemart Toriel.[280] In 1430 twenty Hussite heretics appear to have been on the run.[281]

As the social consequences of Hussite dissent (whether alleged or actually threatening) began to surface during this period, Duke Philip the Good may have felt compelled to resort to a repressive policy. The contemporary chronicler George Chastellain linked the peasant rebellion around Cassel of 1427–1431 to the presence of heretical opinions in the region.[282] On 4 December 1427 Philip ordered the magistrates of his provinces to assist in his search for heretics Willem Bruinart, O.P., who had been appointed inquisitor by the pope and the bishop

[275] Bartos, 'Puer Bohemus', pp. 32–33; Ep. 230.4–10.
[276] Bartos, 'Puer Bohemus', pp. 32–33.
[277] Fredericq III, pp. 74–80 and I, p. 316.
[278] Heimpel, ed., *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren aus dem Jahre 1425*, pp. 99–100.
[279] Fredericq III, p. 66.
[280] Fredericq III, p. 72.
[281] Fredericq I, pp. 312–314.
[282] Fredericq I, p. 319 and A. Desplanque, 'Troubles de la châtellerie de Cassel, sous Philippe le Bon, 1427–1431', *Annales du comité flamand de France* 8 (1864–1865) 218–281, at p. 257.

of Utrecht.[283] Two and a half years later he ordered them to arrest and hand over to the Inquisition the twenty fugitive heretics, followers of "la secte dampnable et perverse desdits Praguois". In 1431 Philip commanded the secular magistrates in the bishoprics of Cambrai and Liège to assist the inquisitor Henry Kaleyser, O.P.[284] Philip never actually mounted a crusade against the Bohemian heretics, although by the spring of 1428 he had decided to do so and the enterprise was begun in drawn-out negotiations.[285] The degree to which the presence of heretics was regarded as a threat to social stability emerges from the fact that Philip's confessor, Laurens Pignon, issued in 1428–1432 two treatises on political theory against "la partie de Boesme et de Prague".[286] In 1432 Hugues of Cayen, bishop of Artois, complained in a letter to the council of Basel about the presence of Hussite heretics in his diocese: "La zizanie, cette mauvaise graine jetée par les Bohémiens, lève en une moisson abondante. Si je ne faisais bonne garde, le froment de vérité ne germerait plus dans le champ du Seigneur; à sa place croîtraient, en touffles envahissantes, les herbes folles de l'erreur".[287]

After about 1430 the number of heresy trials declined significantly. But to conclude from this that Hus and his followers only exercised influence during this brief period (1418–1430) overstates the case. The persecution of heretics primarily reflects the cares and fears of those in power; as such it is not an objective reflection of the presence of certain religious views. As indicated above, the secular authorities resorted to repressive measures in order to preserve a social stability that appeared threatened by the presence of heretics. But after 1430 the Hussite threat disappeared from the political agenda. After the crusades by the papal and imperial armies against the Hussites led by Jan Zizka of Trocnov in the 1420s, negotiations at the Council of Basel resulted in

---

283 Fredericq I, pp. 305–306.

284 Fredericq I, pp. 323–324.

285 See Yvon Lacaze, 'Philippe le Bon et le problème hussite: Un projet de croisade bourguignon en 1428–1429', *Revue historique* 93 (1969) 69–98.

286 See A.J. Vanderjagt, *Laurens Pignon O.P.: Confessor of Philip the Good. Ideas on Jurisdiction and the estates* (Venlo, 1985), pp. 14–15 and 38–42; the quotation (at p. 43) is taken from the dedicatory preface to Philip of Pignon's French translation of the *Circa originem potestatum et iurisdictionum quibus populis regitur* by Durand of St Pourçain (ca. 1275–1334).

287 See J. Toussaint, *Les relations diplomatiques de Philippe le Bon avec le concile de Bâle, 1431–1449* (Louvain, 1942), p. 46.

the agreement (*Compactata*) signed in Prague on 30 November 1433. The next year, at the battle of Lipany, a coalition of Catholics and Utraquists annihilated the radical Taborite wing which had not accepted the treaty. While the threat posed to those in power by the Hussites—whose armies in 1429 had penetrated well into Germany—disappeared, and the fear of unrest and instability vanished, these developments probably caused Hus's Burgundian followers, who may have been encouraged by the initial successes of the Hussites in Bohemia, to be more secretive than they had been before.[288]

At the same time, serious jurisdictional disputes arose between the clergy and the towns. At issue was the disposition of the heretics' confiscated goods. The clergy had appropriated them, but the towns argued that this infringed on their privileges, and Philip decided in their favour. As a result, relations between the magistrates and ecclesiastical authorities deteriorated. Whereas previously they had cooperated closely in the pursuit and persecution of heretics, the clergy now found their activities met with delays and even obstruction.[289]

Although the documents become less numerous, surviving records show that Hussite and Wycliffite dissidents remained in the southern Low Countries until well into the sixteenth century. The sources mention the Dominican Nicholas Jacquier (Jacquerius) of Lille. He was sent by Philip to the king of Hungary in 1452,[290] and was active against Hussites in Tournai and Lille in 1465; in 1466–1467 he did the same work in Bohemia.[291] He composed several treatises, three of which explicitly attack the *secta Bohemorum* and their interpretation of the Eucharist.[292] That these Hussites were more than a figment of his imagination is apparent from his persecution of some heretics called *Turlupins* in Lille

---

[288] See Bartos, 'Picards et "Pikarti"', pp. 480–481, who asked: "Ne serait-il donc pas possible que les hérétiques de Flandre aient manifesté une semblable audace [as the Bohemian Hussites], attisée encore qu'elle était par la foi qu'ils avaient l'accomplissement de la prophétie de Mersault sur la victoire des armées hussites?"

[289] Fredericq III, pp. 76–80; I, pp. 311, 315–319.

[290] Fredericq III, p. 239.

[291] Fredericq III, pp. 115–116.

[292] See Jacques Quétif and Jacques Échard, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum recensiti, notisque historicis et criticis illustrati*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1719–1721), I, 847b–848b: in addition to the *Tractatus de calcatione daemonum* (on which see Van Balberghe and Gilmont, 'Les théologiens et la "Vauderie" au XVe siècle', pp. 399–400), they mention (with locations and editions): *Dialogus de sacra communione contra Hussitas*; *Flagellum haereticorum fascinariorum* and *Excerpta quaedam ex tractatibus quorumdam editis Basileae tempore generalis concilii aduersus sectam Bohemorum asserentium communionem sub vtraque specie esse etiam laicis necessariam ad salutem*.

in 1465, who confessed that Christ was in heaven and for that reason could not be at the same time *au sacrament de l'autel*.[293]

In July of 1485 four followers of Wyclif and Hus were beheaded in Bruges. The chronicler Adrianus de But (1437–1488), a monk from the abbey of Dunes, recorded not only their names (Peter vander Eecken; Nicholas, nicknamed "the Abbot"; Zeger van Roe, and Franciscus of Bassevelde), but also connected their subversive activities to the spread of Wyclif's ideas in the Low Countries: "errores, dudum seminatos per Johannem Wycleff in Bohemia, serpere viderat inter quosdam de Flandria". Like the Hussites they believed that extreme unction was not needed for those who were baptized, that the repentant did not need to confess, and that the church consisted of "the holy community of those who are predestined". With the Hussites they also held that communicants should receive the sacrament in both kinds, that the substance of bread and wine was preserved after consecration and that Christ was not bodily present in the sacrament of the altar.[294] Sufficient proof for the survival of this tradition until the first decades of the sixteenth century is a letter of 28 February 1521 by Jerome Aleander, the papal nuncio, to the papal vice-chancellor, in which he reports that in the regions of Artois and Lille "sono stati descoperti et presi molti heretici, che teneno il vero corpo di Christo non esser in sacramento altaris, sed tantum in signum fieri, secundo l'opinione di Vichleff et di Berengario":[295] many heretics have been discovered, who believe that the true body of Christ is not in the sacrament of the altar, but only as a sign, according to the teachings of Wyclif and Berengar.

---

[293] Fredericq I, pp. 409–411; on the meaning of the word 'turlupin', see Lerner, *The heresy of the Free Spirit*, pp. 52–53 and 165–168, who demonstrates that *originally* the word 'turlupin' was a French synonym for "beghard". In the late Middle Ages it became a denominator for all kind of heresies; Beuzart, *Les hérésies pendant le Moyen Age et la Réforme*, pp. 58–60 typified the heretics tried in Lille in 1465 as 'Waldensians'. As is well-known, both groups (Hussites and Waldensians) had become closely connected and even merged during the late Middle Ages; see Gonnet and Molnar, *Les Vaudois au Moyen Age*, pp. 211–282.

[294] Fredericq III, pp. 141–143; see also A. Dewitte, 'Chronologie van de Reformatie te Brugge en in het Brugse Vrije (1485–1593)', in Dirk van der Bauwhede and Marc Goetinck, edd., *Brugge in de Geuzentijd: Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van de Hervorming te Brugge en in het Brugse Vrije tijdens de zestiende eeuw* (Bruges, 1982), pp. 34–44, at pp. 34–35. De But also recorded that the executed individuals had been inspired by their heresies to engage in a conspiracy against Maximilian of Austria and his young son Philip of Burgundy.

[295] Fredericq V, p. 394.

The texts discussed above make it abundantly clear that Hoen in his *Epistola* did not develop original thoughts, but instead revived age-old heretical arguments in an entirely new and different context. Some of them date back as far as Berengar and the Cathars, others were concentrated in treatises by Wyclif and Hus in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. It appears that these arguments were transmitted through the centuries within secret groups or movements of dissent, and were reflected in orthodox scholastic treatises, where they were mentioned in order to refute them. This current of dissent and its stereotypical arguments against a realistic (or coarse) interpretation of Christ's bodily presence on the altar—in its popular, more radical form, that is, without the cautious and sophisticated reservations of professional theologians like Berengar, Wyclif and Hus—also existed in the fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century Burgundian Netherlands. Against this background Hoen's treatise is no accident. Historians with a pronounced sense of decorum might even wish to typify Hoen as a 'Puer Bohemus redivivus' as most arguments this anonymous author from the Low Countries raised against Christ's bodily presence in the Eucharist are echoed in Hoen's treatise. For this reason, I suggest that Hoen's convictions should be regarded as a terminus of the tradition described here, and as the crystallization of arguments which reached him via this route of dissent.

According to historiographical tradition, many crusaders to Bohemia came back to their fatherland as converts to Hussitism. Hoen's ancestor Hendrik Hoen was one of these crusaders. Were Hussite arguments transmitted from generation to generation within the family?[296]

Albert Hardenberg's *Vita Wesseli Groningensis*, however, probably provides an even better clue to establishing how these ideas reached Hoen. Previous examinations of his record of events have made it clear that it is in many respects untrustworthy. Otto Clemen even wrote (in 1907) that he wanted to give it up as an historical source. Still, Hardenberg could fall back on oral information which was supplied to him by, among others, Jan de Bakker and Hinne Rode, who, as friends of Hoen, must have been well-informed. Though the distance in time between the source of this information (Rode in all probability died ca. 1539) and the point at which Hardenberg recorded it (between 1560–1565) may be the cause of some distortions and errors, it may be the case that

[296] See note 250.

some elements of his narrative do represent the factual course of events, particularly if this probability can be supported by additional evidence. The passage we are concerned with may no longer be verifiable by other, independent, sources, yet it nevertheless deserves credibility since it perfectly matches the information gained by establishing the historical background for Hoen's views.

Hardenberg reported that Hoen and some others (not mentioned by name) found a number of theological writings among the papers left by Jacobus Hoeck, dean of Naaldwijk. Among these was a *vetus scriptum de coena Domini*, which rejected the coarse, 'Capernaitic' eating of the body of Christ and which interpreted the eating instead as a *manducatio spiritualis*. According to Hardenberg this *scriptum* was either one of Wessel Gansfort's writings, or (more probably) a two-hundred-year-old treatise which had circulated among pious men. The finders valued it as a great treasure because in their opinion they could eradicate the entire papal idolatry with this work. Rode consequently travelled with this treatise and with some writings by Wessel to present them to leading reformers in Wittenberg, Basel, Zurich and Strasbourg. This *scriptum* was probably not one of Wessel's writings, since investigation of the relationship between Wessel's and Hoen's ideas shows that their views differed on essential points. Hardenberg's dating of the *vetus scriptum* need scarcely concern us, as at that time techniques for establishing the age of manuscripts were poorly developed. In view of the background to Hoen's ideas, the most likely solution is that it was in fact this *vetus scriptum* which supplied Hoen with the arguments he advanced. It may have been a scholastic treatise which mentioned and refuted these arguments, but it is more than likely, in view of the fact that the treatise itself repudiated the 'Capernaitic' interpretation of the Eucharist, that Hoen found (and interpolated) a heretical text and then handed it over to Rode to gather the reformers' opinion of it. The presence of such a text in the library of a perfectly orthodox dean like Hoeck need not surprise anyone, as he is recorded as possessing writings by Wessel which he handed on to Anthonius de Castro with the request that he refute them (which Castro did after Wessel's death).[297] Hoeck,

[297] In 1488 Anthonius de Castro asked David of Burgundy, bishop of Utrecht, for permission to hold a disputation with Wessel, but the bishop protected Wessel, who died the following year. In 1490 De Castro wrote his tract against Wessel which was not published until 1522, bound together with some works by Wessel and furnished with marginal glosses which refuted and ridiculed its contents. See Anthonius de Castro, *Impugnatorium contra epistolam M. Wesseli Groningensis ad M. Jacobum Hoeck, de indul-*

then, apparently felt responsible for detecting and combating heresy, which explains the presence of such texts among his papers. There are, of course, passages which Hoen added to the manuscript he found: for instance, the reference to Erasmus's *Annotationes*, the passages on judicial images which reveal Hoen's acquaintance with juridical speech and the embedded reference to his contemporary, Martin Luther. On the basis of all available facts, then, I venture to propose that the text of the *Epistola* as it has come down to us should be regarded as an old, heretical text which was interpolated by Hoen.

This proposal, as the next chapter will show, is further confirmed by philological considerations suggested by a comparison of the printed Latin texts. The German translations and Rode's travels, as well as the influence of Hoen's treatise in the Netherlands and abroad, will be discussed there too.

---

gentiis, M. van Rhijn, ed. (The Hague, 1919); S.P. Wolfs, *Das Groninger 'Religionsgespräch' (1523) und seine Hintergründe* (Utrecht–Nijmegen, 1959), pp. 41–42; S.P. Wolfs, *Middeleeuwse Dominicanenkloosters in Nederland*, pp. 16, 25–28, 259–260, 268.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE IMPACT OF HOEN'S *EPISTOLA CHRISTIANA*: PRINTING HISTORY, TRANSLATIONS AND DIFFUSION

1. *Printing history and translations*

Hoen's treatise on the Eucharist was published posthumously. He appears to have died in the winter of 1524/1525—probably before April 1525—while the publication of the *Epistola Christiana admodum* is not mentioned prior to September 1525. In his letter to Pierre Barbier of 3 October 1525, Erasmus wrote that, according to Karlstadt and Zwingli, mere bread and wine were present in the Eucharist, adding that a similar interpretation had been put forward in a letter written "four years ago" by an anonymous Hollander (*Batauus quidam*), now in print.[1] Another indication of the date of publication is given in a letter by Pierre Toussain to Guillaume Farel of 18 September 1525. The Metz reformer praised an anonymously published letter which he had recently read, as it treated the true interpretation of the Eucharist in a concise and learned manner.[2] A day earlier, on 17 September 1525, the

[1] Allen, ep. 1621.18–20: "Batauus quidam ante annos quatuor aegit idem epistola, sed sine nomine, quae nunc excusa est." This phrase by Erasmus on the nationality of the author and the date of composition of his treatise is not an independent witness: both facts are mentioned on the title-page of the *Epistola*.

[2] A.-L. Herminjard, ed., *Correspondance des réformateurs dans les pays de langue française* I: *1512–1526* (Geneva–Paris, 1866), pp. 383–386, at p. 384: "Inter ea quae hactenus legi de Eucharistia, summe mihi placuit Epistola quaedam, quae incerto prodiit autore, quam vellem transfusam in omneis linguas; paucis multa dicit, et meo iudicio non mine doctus quam vere." Though Toussain urged Farel to translate Hoen's *Epistola* into French (p. 384: "si eam verteres gallice …"), this translation was not realized. In the 'Papiers A.-L. Herminjard', vol. VI, no. 234 (University of Geneva, Institut d'Histoire de la Réformation), a note about Hoen/Honius refers to "mon exempl. *Traités sur la Cène*", which is actually a collection of several sixteenth-century treatises on the Eucharist, now preserved in Lausanne (Bibliothèque cantonale et universitaire, TS 1462), and which contains the Strasbourg Latin edition of Hoen's *Epistola*. On Toussain, see Allen, vol. V, pp. 52–53.

Strasbourg reformer Martin Bucer had written an extensive letter to a sympathizing priest, Jacob Otter of Neckarsteinach, mentioning Hoen's *Epistola* as well as its translation into German; he advised Otter to study it as a defence against Johannes Bugenhagen's recent attack on a spiritualist interpretation of the Eucharist:

> Haec tumultuario volui ad Epistolam Pomerani respondere, quae indubie magno ad vos veniet cumulo. Sed vbi legeris Oecolampadij librum [sc. *De genuina verborum … expositione liber*] et Epistolam quam simul mitto, quam versam Domino Johanni [sc. Johannes Landschad von Steinach] quoque misi, nihil te mouebunt tam futilia […] Vnum est in hac Epistola certe docta et pia, quod ob Lutheri sanas posset tibi videri inefficax. Cum dixerint, *hic vel illic est Christus, nolite credere*. Id negat Lutherus intelligi posse de corpore Christi in pane, et non probat tamen, cur neget.[3]

This evidence strongly supports the conclusion that Hoen's treatise was published in the summer of 1525 (July/August).

The text saw two Latin editions. Its full title runs as follows:

> *Epistola Christiana admodum ab annis quatuor ad quendam apud quem omne iudicium sacrae scipturae fuit ex Bathauis missa, sed spreta, longe aliter tractans coenam Dominicam quam hactenus tractata est, ad calcem quibusdam adiectis Christiano homini pernecessariis presertim his periculosis temporibus.*

That is,

> A most Christian letter, sent four years ago from the Netherlands to someone with whom stood the final judgment of Holy Scripture, but spurned by him. This letter presents the Lord's Supper in a very different

[3] *Abendmahlsgutachten ad Jacobum Otterum*, MBDS III, pp. 409–420, at p. 418. See also BCor II, ep. 101 (pp. 35–36), with corrections to the edition in MBDS III. On Otter (ca. 1485–1552), see BCor II, p. 35, note 1. The *Epistola Pomerani* is Johannes Bugenhagen's *Contra nouum errorem de sacramento corporis et sanguinis Christi ad Johannem Hessum* (Wittenberg, 1525); see Georg Geisenhof, *Bibliotheca Bugenhagiana. Bibliographie der Druckschriften des D. Joh. Bugenhagens* (Leipzig, 1908; repr. Nieuwkoop, 1968), nos. 162–173. The other 'epistola' mentioned by Bucer is neither Bugenhagen's letter to Hess (so MBDS III, p. 418, note 47), nor Oecolampadius's letter to the Schwaben preachers (so BCor II, p. 35, note 10), and can only be Hoen's *Epistola*, as only this treatise matches the two characteristics mentioned by Bucer: at the time it was available in Latin as well as in German, and it advanced Mt 24,23 against a realistic interpretation of the Eucharist. On 24 June 1992 Dr. J. Rott (Strasbourg) wrote to me: "Ihr Hinweis auf Mt. 24 hat mich überzeugt, dass es sich bei der Epistola u. deren deutsche Übersetzung um den Honiusbrief handelt." See also Thomas Kaufmann, *Die Abendmahlstheologie der Strassburger Reformatoren bis 1528*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 81 (Tübingen, 1992), pp. 293–294, who reached the same conclusion independently, but draws some incorrect conclusions from it (see *infra*).

> fashion than has hitherto been the case. At the end some additions have been made which are necessary for a Christian, especially in these dangerous times.

The printer of one of the editions was Peter Schöffer the Younger of Worms.[4] Schöffer (ca. 1470–1547) initially worked in Mainz but moved to Worms in 1518. There his production increased, especially after 1523 when he put his presses to the service of Anabaptist and spiritualist circles. His most famous product is the so-called *Wormser Prophetenbibel* (1527–1528), but he also printed Tyndale's New Testament (1525) and treatises by Wyclif, Hans Denck, Ludwig Hätzer, Jacob Kautz and Otto Brunfels.[5]

His edition of Hoen mentions the year of publication (MDXXV) on the title-page. Ever since Daniel Gerdes's unsupported assertion, this edition has generally been seen as a product of the press of the Zürich printer Christoph Froschauer.[6] Since several treatises and letters by the Zürich reformer Ulrich Zwingli reveal that he was well acquainted with Hoen's treatise, Zwingli has commonly been regarded as its editor. For this reason the critical edition of Hoen's *Epistola* has been included in Zwingli's *Werke*.[7] A careful physical examination of the edition, however,

---

[4] See Michael A. Pegg, *A Catalogue of German Reformation Pamphlets (1516–1550) in Swiss Libraries*. Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana, 99 (Baden-Baden, 1983), p. 108, no. 1228; not in VD 16, nor listed in Josef Benzing, 'Peter Schöffer d.J. zu Worms und seine Drucke (1518–1529)', *Der Wormsgau* 5 (1961–1962) 108–118. The title-page of this edition is reproduced in Johannes Luther, *Die Titeleinfassungen der Reformationszeit* I–III (Leipzig, 1909–1913), I, no. 6b. Copies of this edition are extant in the Municipal Library in St Gallen (copy once owned by Joachim Vadianus), in the Royal Library in Berlin and in the University Library of Göttingen.

[5] On Schöffer, see Gustav Mori, 'Peter Schöffer der Jüngere', in *Altmeister der Druckschrift* (Frankfurt a.M., 1940), pp. 81–88; François Ritter, *Histoire de l'imprimerie alsacienne aux XVe et XVIe siècles* (Strasbourg–Paris, 1955), pp. 317–320; Josef Benzing, 'Peter Schöffer d.J. zu Worms', with literature cited; Josef Benzing, *Die Buchdrucker des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts im deutschen Sprachgebiet* (2nd ed., Wiesbaden, 1982), pp. 510–511, with literature cited.

[6] See pp. 19–21. In his introduction to his facsimile edition of Hoen's *Epistola* (*De Avondmaalsbrief van Cornelis Hoen [1525], in facsimile uitgegeven en van inleidng voorzien door Dr. A. Eekhof* [The Hague, 1917]), Eekhof stated that he was not entirely sure that the woodcut title-border was used by Froschauer at the time. Drawing on Alfred Götze's *Die hochdeutschen Drucker der Reformationszeit* (1905; 2nd ed., Berlin, 1963), Walther Köhler also doubted whether Froschauer had been the printer (*Zwingliana* 3 [1913–1920] 322). In his classic on the 'Abendmahlsstreit' between Luther and Zwingli (*Zwingli und Luther: Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl nach seinen politischen und religiösen Beziehungen* I [Leipzig, 1924]), Köhler did not re-open the question. Most confusingly, Georg Finsler attributed the Strasbourg edition to Froschauer: Z IV, p. 509 (under 'A').

[7] Z IV, pp. 512–519. For the attribution to Zwingli, numerous examples could be

has convinced both M.A. Pegg and Helmut Claus that the woodcut title-border and the printing types are those used by Schöffer at the time.[8] Given the lack of any contact between Zwingli and Schöffer, there is no reason to assume that Zwingli edited Hoen's treatise. In 1917 the Leiden professor Albert Eekhof found a copy of this edition in the Royal Library in Berlin and published it in facsimile.[9]

The other Latin edition was published by the Strasbourg printer Johann Knobloch. The text is printed in italic; the title-page mentions neither the name of the printer nor the year of publication.[10] Three copies of this edition have been preserved with a deviant error on the title-page, namely 'paeserrtim' instead of 'praesertim'; this error may have been corrected during the process of printing (stop-press correction).[11] This edition had a modern printing in E.L. Enders's edition of Martin Luther's *Briefwechsel*.[12]

Which of the two editions is the *editio princeps*? As there are no other sources which indicate the priority of one or the other,[13] only a

---

cited, but see Z IV, pp. 505–511; A. Eekhof, ed., *De Avondmaalsbrief van Cornelis Hoen (1525)* (The Hague, 1917), p. v; H.A. Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation*, p. 278, note 40.

[8] See Pegg, *A Catalogue of German Reformation Pamphlets*, no. 1228, and correspondence between Dr. Pegg (Manchester), Dr. Claus (Gotha) and the present writer in the period between October 1988 and January 1989. In one of his letters, Dr. Pegg informed me that this title is one of several titles printed by Schöffer of which the distinguished bibiographer Josef Benzing was not aware. See also Alejandro Zorzin, 'Karlstadts "Dialogus vom Tauff der Kinder" in einem anonymen Wormser Druck aus dem Jahr 1527. Ein Beitrag zur Karlstadtbibliographie', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 79 (1988) 27–58, at p. 37.

[9] *De Avondmaalsbrief van Cornelis Hoen (1525), in facsimile uitgegeven en van inleiding voorzien door Dr. A. Eekhof* (The Hague, 1917).

[10] Pegg, *A Catalogue of German Reformation Pamphlets*, p. 108, no. 1229 (the title wrongly reads 'quam' instead of 'quem'); Jean Muller, *Bibliographie strasbourgeoise*, II–III. Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana, 90, 95 (Baden-Baden, 1985–1986), II, p. 164, no. 479; VD 16, H 4054 and H 4055. Copies of this edition are extant in St Gallen (Stadtbibliothek), Wolfenbüttel (Herzog August Bibliothek), Munich (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek), Geneva (Bibliothèque publique et universitaire), Zurich (Zentralbibliothek), Zofingen (Stadtbibliothek) and Leipzig (Universitätsbibliothek). A manuscript note in the Leipzig copy reads "1525 m. october".

[11] Wolfenbüttel, Herzog August Bibliothek, Wf 875 Theol. 80 (8); also extant in Zurich (Zentralbibliothek) and Munich (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek).

[12] *Dr. Martin Luthers Briefwechsel*, E.L. Enders, ed., III (Calw–Stuttgart, 1889), no. 552 (pp. 412–425).

[13] A manuscript note by Henricus Alting does not give the answer either. In his *Notitiae historicae de Wilhelmo Gnaphaeo* (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Collectio Camerariana, 26 [= Clm 10376], no. 51 [p. 233]; cf. K. Halm and W. Meyer, edd., *Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis* II/1. Catalogus codicum manu

collation of both editions may yield an answer to this question. Eekhof, in the introduction to his facsimile edition, summed up the variants between the Worms (W) and the Strasbourg (S) editions and believed that W was the original edition.[14] In a review of Eekhof's publication, Walther Köhler expressed his agreement: "Das dürfte richtig sein, da die Abweichungen des bisher bekannten Druckes [S] sich deutlich als Glättungen erweisen".[15] Both Eekhof and Köhler thought, then, that W was the original edition because its printing errors had been corrected in S. In 1924, however, Georg Finsler published a critical edition of Hoen's *Epistola* in the fourth volume of *Huldreich Zwinglis sämtliche Werke*, and assumed S to be the *editio princeps* since the printing errors of this edition had been corrected in W.[16] Both Köhler's and Finsler's observations are correct, but the conclusions drawn are incorrect.

In the first place, a comparison of both editions indicates that they differ only slightly. S contains fifteen errors which do not occur in W; W has twenty-nine errors which are not to be found in S. As both editions (W and S) contain errors which are not repeated in the other edition, the question of priority cannot be answered on this basis. In general, reprints do not necessarily contain (apart from corrections) fewer printing errors than their 'Vorlage'; it would only have been possible to solve the question in this way if W repeated a notorious error of S, or vice versa. For instance, the reading 'loquentis' in S may be a correction of 'loquentibus' in W, or 'loquentibus' may be a corruption of 'loquentis'.[17]

The spelling of S is apparently more classical and humanist, avoiding barbarian notations which occur in W. S has *ae* instead of *e*, *idolis* instead of *ydolis*, *satan* instead of *sathan*, *symbolo* instead of *simbolo*. More-

---

scriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis IV/1 [Munich, 1874; repr. Wiesbaden, 1968], p. 237), Alting wrote: "Wilhelmus Gnapheus, artium liberalium magister, et Rector Scholae Hagensis, 1523 et sqq. doctrinam Evangelij inter primos amplexus est. Etiam de S. Coena recte sensit, et libellum incerto authore, de ea editum ad Zwinglium missit. Ipse scripsit formam consolandi aegros." But this passage seems to suggest that Gnapheus (in Alting's view) only sent Hoen's *Epistola* to Zwingli. If Alting means that Gnapheus sent the printed version, his statement is incorrect, as Zwingli saw the text before publication; if he means that Gnapheus sent the text before its publication, he may have accompanied Rode, who was with Zwingli some time in 1523/1524 (see below), and then he may have been mistaken by Zwingli for 'Saganus', a mysterious figure Zwingli mentions but about whose identity nothing further is known.

[14] *De Avondmaalsbrief van Cornelis Hoen*, pp. x–xi.

[15] *Zwingliana* 3 (1913–1920) 322.

[16] Z IV, p. 510.

[17] Ep. 231.14.

over, W, in contrast to S, has a non-classical form of the demonstrative pronoun 'hic': 'hiis' instead of 'his' for the ablative plural, 'hii' instead of 'hi' for the nominative plural. This classical notation is evidently later than the barbarian spelling: classical spelling is conceivable as an improvement of a barbarian one, but a barbarian orthography cannot possibly be based on a classical spelling. For this reason alone, it can be established that S was not the 'Vorlage' of W. The absence of the year of publication on its title-page is another indication that S is not the source of W, but rather an unauthorized 'Nachdruck': Johann Knobloch was a notorious pirate who tried to conceal his infringement of another's copyright by omitting the year.[18]

This leaves two possibilities: either W is prior to S or an unknown (barbarously spelled) version underlies both. There is, however, a significant error in S, which cannot have been derived from W. W reads: "Sed mirum quare non similiter dicant Iohannem Baptistam transubstantiatum in Heliam […] Vel si hoc loco expositionem accipimus, dicendo: 'Petra erat Christus', id est, representabat Christum, quare *in proposito* idem non audemus, maxime cum ait", etc. (italics mine).[19] The meaning of the underlined words is plainly: "in what has been raised / proposed here". S, however, reads here *in praeposito*, which is evidently incorrect. As W at this place has clearly written *plene* 'proposito', and not the abbreviation *pro*posito (as it has some lines later, 'de quo in *pro*posito'),[20] W plainly does not underlie the incorrect reading in S. From this it may be inferred that the most likely genealogy is that both W and S are based on an earlier version, which had a barbarian orthography (repeated in W and corrected in S) and which read 'in *pro*posito' (correctly interpreted by W as 'in proposito', incorrectly by S as 'in praeposito'). This copy could have been either a manuscript or a printed edition, but as no other Latin edition has been transmitted, we can safely assume that it was a manuscript. It may have been Hoen's autograph. If we accept, however, that Rode took this autograph on his travels to several centres of the Reformation in Germany and Switzerland, it is most likely that mutually independent transcriptions were made (in Worms and in Strasbourg) which underlie W and S. What-

[18] On Knobloch, see Josef Benzing, *Die Buchdrucker des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts im deutschen Sprachgebiet*, p. 438; Charles Schmidt, *Jean Knobloch, 1500–1528*. Répertoire bibliographique strasbourgeois jusque vers 1530, 7 (Strasbourg, 1895).

[19] Ep. 228.11–19. (Finsler incorrectly chose the reading 'praeposito').

[20] Ep. 228.32. (Finsler's *apparatus criticus* is incorrect here).

ever the case, these observations have far-reaching implications for the answers to several questions surrounding the printing history of Hoen's *Epistola*.

The title of the printed edition was obviously added, either by an editor or by the printer. It reveals that the treatise was written by a Hollander ("Batavian"), whose interpretation of the Eucharist differed from received opinion. He had sent his treatise to a man with whom rested "the final authority of Scripture", but this man had spurned it. The title, moreover, informed the reader that at the end of the treatise some passages had been added, omitting the identity of the person who compiled these additions. These lines have raised several questions. Who was the editor of Hoen's treatise? Who was the original addressee of his letter? Where did Hoen's letter end and where did the additions by the editor begin?

Traditionally, the answer to the question of the original addressee was based on Hardenberg's *Vita Wesseli*. Hardenberg wrote that Hinne Rode took Wessel's writings and Hoen's treatise to Martin Luther in Wittenberg, who dismissed the contents of Hoen's letter. Combined with the information revealed by the title-page of 1525, it was generally argued that in 1521 ("four years ago") Rode visited Luther (the theologian "apud quem omne iudicium sacrae scripturae fuit") to present Hoen's ideas to him, but Luther spurned them. As Zwingli was the alleged editor, the publication of Hoen's treatise was regarded as an attack by Zwingli on Luther.

In contrast, Walther Köhler defended the position that not Luther, but Erasmus, was the person to whom Hoen addressed his treatise. Köhler advanced the following arguments. On the assumption that Zwingli was the editor, Köhler first examined the date of publication of Hoen's letter. In 1525, Roman Catholics as well as Erasmus were attempting to cause a rift between Luther and Zwingli. The Swiss theologians (Zwingli, Leo Jud and Johannes Oecolampadius), on the other hand, were trying to win both Luther and Erasmus over to their camp. One example is Leo Jud's treatise *Des Hochgelehrten Erasmi von Rotterdam und Doctor Luthers Maynung vom Nachtmal unsers Herren Jesu Christi*. In this context it is most unlikely that the words allegedly written by Zwingli on the title-page ("Epistola […] ad quendam apud quem omne iudicium sacrae scripturae fuit, ex Bathauis missa, sed spreta") were directed against Luther, for at that time Zwingli would not have brought to light the fact that a treatise he approved of and had edited

had been spurned by Luther. Toussain's letter to Guillaume Farel of 18 September 1525, moreover, had informed the Swiss brethren that Erasmus was about to write "ad defendendum Deum impanatum". This expectation gives—according to Köhler—a perfectly good meaning to the word 'spreta' in the title: Erasmus, on the verge of attacking the figurative interpretation of the Eucharist, had only recently scorned the *Epistola* allegedly addressed to him, resulting in this very interpretation. Zwingli's edition, then, was directed against Erasmus, and reveals that the letter had been addressed to Erasmus and not to Luther. The word 'fuit' of the title applied to Erasmus's imminent attack: Zwingli had acknowledged his indebtedness to Erasmus's 'scripturae iudicium', but now that he was to oppose the (in Zwingli's opinion) scriptural interpretation of the Lord's Supper, Zwingli abandoned his dependence. Furthermore, Köhler wrote that the date "four years ago" is problematic in Luther's case, since Luther was in hiding in the Wartburg from April 1521, while Erasmus could easily have received Hoen's letter because he was staying in Basel from November 1521. Köhler also believed that a treatise addressed to Erasmus was the more likely option since Erasmus too came from the Netherlands. Finally, Erasmus in his letter to Barbier wrote of a "Batauus quidam", by whom he obviously meant Hoen. In view of the circumstances Erasmus's casual remark was deliberate: "Sollte der Kühle Zufall sein?"[21]

Köhler's authoritative view is reflected in the decision of the editors of the Weimar edition of Luther's works to omit Hoen's *Epistola* from Luther's correspondence.[22] Nevertheless, J. Trapman considered Köhler's arguments implausible. Given Erasmus's formulation in his letter to Barbier, Trapman concluded that Erasmus became acquainted with Hoen's treatise through Zwingli's edition. Apparently unaware that Hoen was the author, Erasmus derived the designation "Batauus quidam" as well as the date "ab annis quattuor" from the title-page of the printed edition.[23]

The question of which part of the printed edition was written by Hoen himself and which part was added by an editor has also been given different and mutually exclusive answers. In 1873 J.G. de Hoop Scheffer argued that the part written by Hoen ended with the words "non dicit

[21] Köhler, *Erasmus und Luther* I, pp. 154–155.
[22] See WA BR II, p. 572.
[23] Trapman, *De Summa der godliker scrifturen*, pp. 114–115.

Dominus: in hoc vel illo verbo, sed: in omni":[24] "what follows is by Zwingli". De Hoop Scheffer, however, did not advance any arguments to substantiate this.[25] In 1889 E.L. Enders had the part by Hoen end with the quote from Mt 24,26; the words "Dei tui verbum est, lector" marked the beginning of Zwingli's additions. Enders, however, also failed to give his arguments for this choice.[26]

In 1917 A. Eekhof proposed placing the beginning of Zwingli's part at a much earlier point in Hoen's text, namely, at the words "Est praeterea, quod fidem romanam reddit suspectam".[27] In the first place, Eekhof thought that the opposition to the comparison of Christ's presence in the host with the presence of fire in hot iron could not have been made by Hoen, as this comparison had been made by Luther and Hoen would not have asked Luther's opinion on a treatise in which his own views were attacked. In the second place, Eekhof was of the opinion that in 1521 Hoen could not have written that the Roman Catholic church was largely in ruins, while the references to Gen. 40 and Gen. 41 should be considered as being among the additions, since Zwingli had regularly used these comparisons in his writings.[28] Ten years later, Köhler challenged Eekhof's arguments. The image of fire and iron, Köhler argued, was derived from scholastic theology: in this passage Hoen was therefore challenging not Luther but traditional theology. In 1521, moreover, the Reformation reached a pinnacle; Hoen may have thought that the traditional church had collapsed. Additionally, Zwingli had only used the images from Gen. 40 and Gen. 41 in his letter to Mattheus Alber of 16 November 1524; since Zwingli had by that time already seen Hoen's treatise, it is more than likely that he derived these references from Hoen. Like Enders, Köhler had Zwingli's part begin shortly after the passage on fire and iron, with the words "Dei tui verbum est, lector".[29] Oberman placed the caesura before the words *Detestandum hoc est*, as the next sentence about fire and iron in his view "refers back to Luther's 1520 writing 'On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church'".[30]

---

[24] Ep. 233.30–32.
[25] De Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der Kerkhervorming in Nederland*, p. 98.
[26] Enders, ed., *Dr. Martin Luthers Briefwechsel* III, p. 421, line 348.
[27] Ep. 231.27.
[28] Eekhof, ed., *De Avondmaalsbrief van Cornelis Hoen (1525)*, pp. xix–xxi.
[29] See Z IV, p. 508.
[30] Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation*, p. 278, note 40. If the passage (which is given in translation in the note referred to) might after all have belonged to Hoen's

All these discussions, however, were based on the assumption that Froschauer of Zurich was the printer and Zwingli the editor of Hoen's treatise. Now that these attributions have been proved to be incorrect, the detailed discussions on other questions summarized here—the original addressee and the scope of the alleged editorial additions—are in fact futile.

Thomas Kaufmann, a German theologian from Göttingen, has recently proposed a new editor and interpolator. In Kaufmann's view, "die Urausgabe des lateinischen Druckes" of "der berühmte Hoenbrief" as well as "die erste Ausgabe der deutschen Übersetzung" must be ascribed to Martin Bucer, "der Strassburger".[31] What are Kaufmann's arguments for his proposal?

1. In Bucer's well-known letter to Otter of 17 September 1525 (cited above), Bucer recommended Hoen's *Epistola*. In the concluding part of this extensive letter—which is a treatise refuting Bugenhagen's arguments, and a defence of the Swiss position—Bucer asks Otter to keep *mea haec scriptio* "a secret" ("für die Geheimhaltung der Epistola Sorge zu tragen").[32] Kaufmann (whose translation is at least questionable, for *patrocinari* means 'to protect') thinks that Bucer is referring here to Hoen's *Epistola*, but evidently Bucer is referring to his long manuscript letter to Otter. (Bucer, moreover, would hardly ask his colleague "to keep secret" a published treatise.)
2. With this first argument refuted, the other points advanced by Kaufmann appear highly speculative. He mentions Bucer's active propaganda for Hoen's *Epistola* and writes that Bucer's editing of the text would be in complete accord with his polemic against Bugenhagen. But hints of this kind are not sufficient to ascribe to Bucer the editorship of the *Epistola*.[33]
3. A more serious error in Kaufmann's argument is his appeal to the enigmatic Konrad Ryss. In an earlier, extensive and seem-

---

original text, then, Oberman observes, "it is as such sufficient explanation why Luther would spurn it, since it is this image which reflects Luther's doctrine of consubstantiation: the fire does not replace the substance of the iron but is intimately united with it by pervading it".

[31] Kaufmann, *Die Abendmahlstheologie der Strassburger Reformatoren bis 1528*, p. 292.

[32] MBDS III, p. 418: "Ad quod si mea haec scriptio fuerit patrocinata, bene erit. Sin, vides animum tui studiosum."

[33] Kaufmann, *Die Abendmahlstheologie der Strassburger Reformatoren bis 1528*, p. 294.

ingly well-documented article in the *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, Kaufmann went to great pains to demonstrate that in October 1525 Bucer wrote an *Antwurt dem Hochgelerden Doctor Joan. Bugenhagen* under the pseudonym of Konrad Ryss.[34] This name, however, was not a pseudonym at all: on 9 March 1528 "der ersam herr Conradt Ryss, priester" bought himself the citizenship of Strasbourg.[35] The misidentification of Bucer and Ryss caused Kaufmann to regard the treatise on the Lord's Supper announced in the editorial additions of Hoen's *Epistola* as the treatise by Ryss and, even worse, to regard many passages in Hoen's *Epistola* as interpolations by Bucer/Ryss.[36] Unfamiliar with the late medieval background to various arguments (for example the references to ICor 10,16, Mt 24,23 and ICor 10,4),[37] and deceived by his identification of Ryss with Bucer, Kaufmann's philological excursions[38] resulted from his evident wish—concealed behind long-winded flashiness—to inflate Bucer's role in the "Abendmahlsstreit".

4. Underlying his proposal and arguments is the assumption that S was the *editio princeps*, which it was not, as we have seen.[39]

---

[34] Thomas Kaufmann, "Zwei unerkannte Schriften Bucers und Capitos zur Abendmahlsfrage aus dem Herbst 1525", *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 81 (1990) 158–188.

[35] Ch. Wittmer and J.Ch. Meyer, edd., *Le livre de bourgeoisie de la ville de Strasbourg, 1440–1530* I–III (Strasbourg, 1948–1961) II, no. 8551.

[36] Kaufmann, *Die Abendmahlstheologie der Strassburger Reformatoren bis 1528*, pp. 294–297. See also p. 300, note 193, where Kaufmann writes that Hoen's "Wunderkritik" may well have been derived from Oecolampadius's *De genuina verborum expositione*, while we have seen that this theme had already been elaborated by Wyclif in passages which are echoed in Hoen's treatise.

[37] Kaufmann mentions "der möglicherweise von Capito veranlasste Schöffersche Druck von Wyclifs *Trialogus*" (sic! the editor was Otto Brunfels), but adds that this treatise "nicht in den Zusammenhang der hier zu skizzierenden Strassburger Publikationsoffensive [gehört], da das Impressum bereits das Datum 7. März 1525 trägt". (Kaufmann, *Die Abendmahlstheologie der Strassburger Reformatoren bis 1528*, p. 293, note 137).

[38] Kaufmann even proposes deleting Ep. 227.19–28 from the original text, as the reference to ICor 10,16 in his view must have been interpolated, while, as we have seen, the argument was also advanced by *Puer bohemus*. In a note Kaufmann next adds that the word "illis" (Ep. 227.29) refers to "dicentibus" (Ep. 227.16), which would imply that, in Kaufmann's view, Hoen must have originally made a plea for cannibalism, writing that he should not believe those who say that Christ is in the bread ("quare fidem habere non debeo dicentibus in pane esse Christum") and that for that reason he should abstain from them ("ab illis") "nisi sine discretione sumerentur".

[39] Kaufmann, *Die Abendmahlstheologie der Strassburger Reformatoren bis 1528*, p. 29; referring to Z IV, p. 510, Kaufmann writes: "Finsler's Stemma ist trotz einiger Fehler im Apparat nach erneuter Prüfung beizubehalten." Kaufmann repeated his ideas in 'Streittheologie und Friedensdiplomatie: die Rolle Martin Bucers im frühen Abendmahlsstreit', in Christian Krieger and Marc Lienhard, edd., *Martin Bucer and Sixteenth Century*

5. Bucer and Oecolampadius were concerned at this time to show the antiquity of their views and the agreement of their views with those of the church fathers, while the editorial heading of Hoen's *Epistola* states that it presents the Lord's Supper in a very different fashion than had hitherto been the case.

The questions raised by the puzzling title-page could, however, have much simpler answers, if we accept some of the (tentative) conclusions drawn at the end of the preceding chapter and on the first pages of the present one. If we accept that the most likely state of affairs was that Hoen did indeed find a *vetus scriptum*, a text to which he added some passages (such as the reference to Erasmus, judicial images and the embedded reference to Luther), and if we also accept that Rode took Hoen's autograph (the *vetus scriptum* with Hoen's interpolations) to several centres of the Reformation where—in Worms and Strasbourg—it was the source for mutually independent transcriptions, the conclusion follows that the additions, which are identical in both editions, were part of the manuscript which formed the basis of both transcriptions. There is therefore no objection to the proposition that Hoen was the author who added these final parts.

If this is accepted, Hoen's additions voice opinions which are characteristic of radical lay theology from the early years of the Reformation.[40] The additions—which undoubtedly begin with the line in which the reader is directly addressed for the first time[41]—have more of a social purpose; while the preceding text is concerned with the individual believer, the epilogue is directed towards the brethren and their community. (Also, in the main text the sacrament of the altar is referred to as the Eucharist, while in the final part it is called *coena Domini*, a difference which may, however, derive from the pre-existing phraseology of the *vetus scriptum*.)[42] In the epilogue[43] the tendency to concentrate the discussion about the Eucharist exclusively on the words of institution is corrected with an appeal to Christ's saying (Mt 4,4) that a Christian should live according to *every* word that proceeds out of the mouth

---

Europe: Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg (28–31 aout 1991), 2 vols. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, 52–53 (Leiden, 1993), I, pp. 239–256, see pp. 244–245, note 23.

[40] On this subject, see Paul A. Russel, *Lay Theology in the Reformation: Popular Pamphleteers in Southwest Germany, 1521–1525* (Cambridge, 1986).

[41] Ep. 233.30: "Dei tui verbum est, lector [….]"

[42] Ep. 226.12 and 230.4 have *coena* but refer to the historical event of the Last Supper (*in ultima coena*).

[43] Ep. 233.30 – 235.4.

of God.[44] Too many books, says the author, have already been written about the words of institution, and these works have diverted the attention of their readers from the Bible. As only the word of God carries authority, no man is free to do or say what Christ has not expressly forbidden. Taking consecrated hosts and wine cannot aid our neighbours. The essential Christian life does not consist in taking the Lord's Supper, but in obedience to Christ's commandments as given in Io 13–18 and in the Sermon on the Mount, which explain briefly what Christ taught at the Last Supper. These admonitions are larded with apocalyptic warnings for professional theologians who formerly said they were Thomists, Scotists, Jeromists, Augustinians or Franciscans, but who now even pose as Christ himself.

Both the title of the printed *Epistola* and the announcement at the end of the text of a future publication on the Eucharist were clearly added by someone else. It goes without saying that this applies to the title, but the same is true for the final sentence. This becomes abundantly clear when we consider the curious discrepancy between the added part and this sentence. The author of the additions deplores the excessive out-put of treatises on the Eucharist, while he announces yet another, even more elaborate study on this theme.[45] Here the name of Hinne Rode first comes to mind as he was best informed about the circumstances of the *Epistola*'s compilation and its distribution.[46]

If, however, the presupposition underlying this proposal were to be proved incorrect and W established as being prior to S, I would venture to propose Otto Brunfels (1488–1534) as a possible candidate for the editorship.[47] In 1525 Brunfels was attached to Schöffer's as a proofreader and in March he edited Wyclif's *Trialogus* under the title of *Io[annis] Vviclefi […] dialogoru[m] libri quattuor*.[48] During this period he also

---

[44] The same point is made in the anonymous preface to the 1526 German translation of Hoen's letter, A3recto.

[45] See also Kaufmann, *Die Abendmahlstheologie der Strassburger Reformatoren bis 1528*, p. 294, note 149.

[46] I have not, however, succeeded in identifying any one tract on the Eucharist as the one intended in this last but one sentence of the printed letter. The Jacobite reservation ("si id voluerit Deus") may have been unfulfilled.

[47] On Brunfels, see Jean-Claude Margolin, 'Otto Brunfels dans le milieu évangelique rhénan', in Georges Livet, Francis Rapp and Jean Rott, edd., *Strasbourg au coeur religieux du XVIe siècle: Hommage à Lucien Febvre* (Strasbourg, 1977), pp. 111–141, and the lemma by Miriam Usher Chrisman in *Contemporaries of Erasmus* I, pp. 206–207 (with literature), who typifies Brunfels as "always an outsider and a target of complaint".

[48] Benzing, 'Peter Schöffer d.J. zu Worms und seine Drucke (1518–1529)', p. 111;

edited Hussite treatises (from Ulrich of Hutten's library) and dedicated the first and third volumes to Luther.[49] At the end of 1524, however, he was in Basel, where he met Karlstadt and the latter's brother-in-law Gerard Westerburg, and was won over to the radical's position.[50] Luther knew about this by December 1524[51] and appears to have called Brunfels to account in a letter now lost. Brunfels in his reply frankly stated that in his view the Holy Spirit was in Karlstadt and that his love for Luther was not so exclusive as to prevent him from embracing Karlstadt. In an earlier publication against the Mass, Brunfels had already defined the Eucharist as *pignus redemptionis nostrae*, to which the believer should cling with true faith as historical faith was insufficient,[52] while in his *Pandectarum Veteris et Noui Testamenti libri XII* (1527) he described the Eucharist as characteristically commemorative of Christ's sufferings and death.[53] In his *Pandectarum libri XIII de tropis, figuris et modis*

Pegg, *A Catalogue of German Reformation Pamphlets in Swiss Libraries*, no. 5279; Williel R. Thomson, *The Latin Writings of John Wyclif*, pp. 79–83, who is (pp. 81–82, note 11), however, unnecessarily uncertain about the editor: in a letter to Luther, Brunfels writes about Wyclif "quem et ipsum quoque curauimus vt ederetur" (WA BR III, p. 477.20–21). In his three-page preface Brunfels wrote that the text had reached him from a far away place: "is ipse [sc. Wyclif] est qui iam sole reluctente, tenebras ac denissimas lucis inimicas nebulas propulsante, ab inferis solertissimi cuiusdam typographi benefitio et opera non vulgari ex longinquis adscitus, in lucem reuiuiscens prodit […]" (A2verso). The impressum is dated 7 March 1525.

[49] See WA BR III, ep. 770 (pp. 332–336; August 1524) and ep. 858 (pp. 476–478; April 1525). Luther's cordial letter to Brunfels of October 1524 was printed in front of the second volume of Hussite writings (WA BR III, ep. 783 [p. 359]). For these Hussite writings, see Miriam Usher Chrisman, *Bibliography of Strasbourg Imprints, 1480–1599* (New Haven–London, 1982), p. 329 (nos. 12.7–12.10), and Siegfried Hoyer, 'Jan Hus und der Hussitismus in den Flugschriften des ersten Jahrzehnts der Reformation', in Hans-Joachim Köhler, ed., *Flugschriften als Massenmedium der Reformationszeit: Beiträge zum Tübinger Symposion 1980*. Spätmittelalter und Frühe Neuzeit, 13 (Stuttgart, 1981), pp. 291–307, at pp. 293, 297.

[50] See Alejandro Zorzin, 'Karlstadts "Dialogus vom Tauff der Kinder" in einem anonymen Wormser Druck aus dem Jahr 1527. Ein Beitrag zur Karlstadtbibliographie', pp. 38–39.

[51] See WA BR III, ep. 804 (pp. 399–400; Luther to Spalatin, 14 December 1524), at p. 399.9–10: "Othonem Brunfeldium caepit [Karlstadt], quem et solum illic [sc. in Basel] allocutus est"; WA BR III, ep. 827 (pp. 437–438; Luther to Wenzeslau Linck, d.d. 7 February 1525), at p. 437.11–14: "Respondi Carlstadio [that is, in his *Wider die himmlischen Propheten*], sicut vides. Basileae subuertit multos, Oecolampadium, Pellicanum et alios, alioqui huc procliues antea, item Argentinae Ottonem Brunsfelsium et alios, vt nos rideant tam securi de sua opinione".

[52] Otto Brunfels, *Verbum Dei multo magis expedit audire quam Missam, ad episcopum Basiliensem* (Strasbourg: Schott, 1523), D3verso.

[53] Manfred Krebs and Hans-Georg Rott, edd., *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer* VII:

loquendi scripturarum (1528), writing about biblical metaphors, he mentioned as an example Christ who is called bread in Io 6 and cited as proof texts like *Ecce, agnus Dei* and *Ego sum vitis vera.*[54] Would it be too bold to think of Brunfels—who held some of Hoen's central views, was a self-confessed sympathizer with Karlstadt and who worked for Schöffer's press at the time—as the person who added anti-Lutheran passages? Brunfels knew that the treatise had been spurned by Luther, in whom, as far as he too was concerned, all spiritual authority had been vested,[55] the more so since the added part refuted arguments which Luther in 1522 had used against Karlstadt's impatient innovations?

To whom, finally, might Hoen have wished to address his treatise? Whom did he regard as the leading authority in matters scriptural? Two contemporaries deserve consideration, Erasmus and Luther, but the scale of evidence tips to Luther. Though Hoen referred favourably to Erasmus's *Annotationes*, there is some distance between the two. Hoen's view is plainly more radical. While Hoen derived some of his ideas from Luther's *De Captiuitate*, Erasmus was very critical of that treatise.[56] In addition, the circle Hoen belonged to became more and more critical of Erasmus's behaviour, as the letter by Canirivus makes clear. Finally, it will be demonstrated below that Rode was probably in Wittenberg in the early 1520s, which may indicate that Hoen sent his treatise to Luther first to seek his judgment. Hoen's critical remark about comparing Christ's presence in the eucharistic bread with fire in a heated iron need not weaken this conclusion, as the image may have reached Hoen from other sources.[57] And if he had read it in Luther's work he may have been willing to discuss this position since he had advanced arguments (notably Mt 24,23) that, in this view, refuted it.

Hoen's text was soon translated into German; the translation appeared in three editions. The first German translation was printed in Stras-

---

Elsass I: *Stadt Strassburg, 1522–1532*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte, 26 (Gütersloh, 1959), no. 77 (pp. 75–78), at pp. 77.30–78.5.

[54] Otto Brunfels, *Pandectarum libri XIII de tropis, figuris et modis loquendi scripturarum* (Strasbourg: J. Schott, 1528), A2verso.

[55] In his letter of 17 October 1524 Luther wrote: "Nihil est, mi Otho, me non agnoscere officium et affectum tuum in me" (WA BR III, p. 359.3–4).

[56] See Allen, ep. 1217.37–39: "[Consilium] exhibitum fuit ante vulgatam Captiuitatem Babylonicam, cum res esset adhuc sanabilior".

[57] See the discussion *supra*, pp. 125–127.

bourg by Wolfgang Köpfel in September ("im Herbstmonat") 1525.[58] The translator may have been Martin Bucer, who knew about the translation as early as September 1525 and who propagated it (as we will see below); the translation, however, is literal and its language smooth, whereas Bucer's translations are normally very free and their language awkwardly complicated. The Strasbourg edition was reprinted by Andreas Cratander in Basel in 1526. One copy of this edition was recorded in the Kantonsbibliothek of Chur, but now seems to be lost; the title, however, is identical to the Strasbourg edition.[59] A second German translation was printed by Philipp Ulhart in Augsburg in August 1526.[60] Ulhart was active in Augsburg from 1523. After a period during which he warmly favoured Luther, he became, after 1525, an ardent supporter of spiritualistic circles and printed tracts against the Wittenberg doctrine of the Eucharist. Ulhart's new line is reflected, for instance, in his printing of an excerpt from Bucer's 'translation' of Bugenhagen's commentary on the Psalms. This was exactly the part which had aroused the indignation of Luther and Bugenhagen, namely Bucer's Zwinglian additions to Bugenhagen's exposition on Ps 111,5.[61] And Michael Keller, a preacher from Augsburg, edited a cycle of sermons against transubstantiation in 1525, to which he added anti-Lutheran passages in the second edition of 1526.[62] Ulhart also printed treatises by Karlstadt, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Martin Reinhart and Melchior Hoffman; a translation of Hoen's work fits well into this programme.

---

[58] *Von dem brot vnd weyn des HERREN Christlicher beriecht. M.D.XXV. Im Herbstmonat* (s.l., s.a.). See Pegg, *A Catalogue of German Reformation Pamphlets in Swiss Libraries*, no. 276; Pegg, *A Catalogue of German Reformation Pamphlets (1516–1546) in Libraries of Great Britain and Ireland*. Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana, 45 (Baden-Baden, 1973), no. 162; Miriam Usher Chrisman, *Bibliography of Strasbourg Imprints, 1480–1599*, p. 287, no. 2.7; Benzing, *Bibliographie strasbourgeoise: Bibliographie des ouvrages imprimés à Strasbourg au XVIe siècle*. Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana, 50 (Baden-Baden, 1981), no. 769; Muller, *Bibliographie strasbourgeoise* II, p. 275, no. 53. Copies are extant in Munich (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek), Zurich (Zentralbibliothek), Basel (University Library), Bern (Municipal Library), Edinburgh (National Library).

[59] Pegg, *A Catalogue of German Reformation Pamphlets in Swiss Libraries*, no. 277.

[60] See Karl Schottenloher, *Philipp Ulhart: ein Augsburger Winkeldrucker und Helfershelfer der "Schwärmer" und "Wiedertäufer" (1523–1529)*. Historische Forschungen, 4 (Munich–Freising, 1921; repr. Nieuwkoop, 1967), pp. 33–34, 126, no. 136. Copies are extant in Munich (Bayerische Staatsbibliothek) and Zurich (Zentralbibliothek). Because of its rarity and inaccessibility, I have given the text in Appendix 2.

[61] Schottenloher, *Philipp Ulhart*, p. 125, no. 133.

[62] Schottenloher, *Philipp Ulhart*, pp. 119–120, no. 108, pp. 125–126, no. 134; Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther* I, pp. 263–270.

Both translations are fairly literal, but there are some significant differences between the Latin and the German texts. In general, it may be said that the character of the translation is doctrinally more radical. The word *eucharistia* has consistently been translated as *Nachtmal* or by some reformed equivalent; the word is mentioned once, but is immediately followed by the explanation "Dasz ist des Herren brot".[63] In addition, the word *ecclesia* has been translated as *gemain*. The same translation (*gemain Gottes*) is used for the impersonal subject of one of the opening phrases of the Latin text, where the relationship between Christ (*sponsus*) and his bride (*sponsa*) is described.[64] While Hoen wrote that the pope, perhaps, remitted part of the punishment imposed for sins for money (*forsan pro pecuniis*), the translator is more certain about the pope's motives: "und das thut er umbs gelt".[65] Hoen's remarkable exegesis of Mt 16,18 has been modified in the translation, the controversial words *se demonstrans* being eliminated.[66] The enumeration of external services which together comprise the Roman pomp is extended in the translation: the *Sacramentshawszlin* are added, and the *castimonia* of the priests has effectively been translated as *Sodomitische keüschait*.[67] Where in the Latin text Christ is said to give himself *per panem*, these words in one instance have been omitted by the translator; some lines later, however, the same words have been translated as *durchs brot*, so we hesitate to argue that the formulation was unacceptable to the translator.[68] Some

[63] *Von dem brot und weyn des HERREN*, A4recto; *Ein Christlicher bericht*, B2verso.

[64] Ep. 226.17–19: "Similiter sumens eucharistiam, pignus sponsi sui, qui se ipsum dare testatur, firmiter credere debet [sponsa] Christum iam esse suum"; *Von dem brot und weyn des HERREN*, A1verso–A2recto and *Ein Christlicher bericht*, B1recto: "Auff dise weysz hat die gemain Gottes das brot und weyn von Christo angenommen als ain pfandt irs gemahels, welcher bezeüget das er sich ir ergeben hab".

[65] Ep. 233.9; *Von dem brot und weyn des HERREN*, B3verso; *Ein Christlicher bericht*, C2recto.

[66] Ep. 228.11–18: "Sed mirum, quare non similiter dicant […] Christum [transsubstantiatum] in petram, cum se demonstrans ait: *Supra hanc petram*, et rursum petram in Christum, cum Paulus dixit: *Petra erat Christus* […], id est, repraesentabat Christum." *Von dem brot und weyn des HERREN*, A3verso and *Ein Christlicher bericht*, B2verso: "Aber das ist zu verwundern, warumb sy nicht ausz gleycher ursach sagen, das der felsz [sey] in Christum [verwandelt], so Paulus sagt: *Der felsz war Christus* [ICor 10,4], das ist, er zaygt an Christum".

[67] Ep. 232.5–15; *Von dem brot und weyn des HERREN*, B2verso; *Ein Christlicher bericht*, C1recto–verso.

[68] Ep. 232.16–25; *Von dem brot und weyn des HERREN*, B2verso–B3recto; *Ein Christlicher bericht*, C1verso. This difference between the Latin and the German texts has been noted by Trapman, *De Summa der godliker scrifturen (1523)*, p. 116.

other remarkable passages are the translation of *universa religio papae* as *des gantzen Bapstumbs gaystlichait*, *vortayl und grund*, of *abominatio ista* as *unser unglaub*, and *vix mense uno* as *in vil zeyt*.[69]

The Augsburg translation is, apart from the orthography, identical with the Strasbourg translation; only the title differs. The Strasbourg translation reproduces all the information given in the Latin title,[70] while the Augsburg translation only has *Ein Christlicher bericht von dem Brot vnd Weyn desz Herren* (A1recto), and *Sandtbrief vnd Bericht das Nachtmal des Herren betreffendt* (A2recto). Both translations are based on the Strasbourg Latin text; the phrase "Iam videre licet quam obscura et incerta sunt omnia a Romanis nostris hic *inserta*" (italics added) has been translated as "Darausz man syhet, wie gar verdunckelt und ungewisz sein alle treüm der Römer, so sy ins Nachtmal *eingefüret* haben" (italics added), while the Worms text has the variant *asserta* for *inserta*.

The Augsburg print, in contrast to the Strasbourg edition, contains a lengthy preface in which the author propounds the reasons why the treatise (and its preface) is published anonymously.[71] Anonymity, he writes, neutralizes "drey grosse treffentlich und schedliche ursachen":

1. Readers of theological works are inclined to attribute to their authors the honour and authority which belongs only to the word of God. This causes pride in many authors and calls into existence many and diverse sects: "Ich bin Tertulianisch, Cyprianisch, oder ich halt den weg Jheronymi, Augustini", they shout. Universities, too, have all chosen some *via*, the *weg Thome* or the *weg Scoti*. Ultimately, the Roman church has gone so far as to appoint four theologians as the four pillars of the church. Traditionally, Jerome, Augustine, Ambrose and Gregory the Great were regarded as such, but the author seems to hint at Thomas, Scotus, Augustine

[69] Ep. 232.11, 233.19 and 233.35, *Von dem brot und weyn des HERREN*, B2verso, B3verso, B4recto; *Ein Christlicher bericht*, C1verso, C2recto, C2verso.

[70] *Von dem brot vnd weyn des HERREN Christlicher beriecht*, A1verso: "Christlicher bericht. Dise fast Christliche Epistel ist geschriben für vier iaren zu einem fürnemen vnnd wolbekannten bey dem alles vrteil der geschrifft stunde, vnd ausz Hollandt überschicket, aber von jm nit sunders geachtet, inn welcher von des HERREN abentmal vil anders gehandelt wirt *vnnd neher bey der geschrifft vnd dem geyst Christi* dann andere biszher gethan haben. Mit christlicher ermanung eim yeden nit vnfruchtbar zu wissen, *dann biszher vnser glaub grausamlich durch die verfurung beschwert gewesen ist*." The words in italic (italics added) have no equivalent in the Latin text.

[71] *Ein Christlicher bericht von dem Brot vnd weyn desz Herren*, A2recto–A4verso.

and Jerome. In any case, Christ himself had admonished his disciples to study only the Scriptures as these were the sole witness to him. The neglect of Scripture is also the reason why the doctrine of transubstantiation is propagated now; if they would read St Paul, they would soon learn that the apostle did not call the bread Christ's body.[72]

2. Theological treatises may be spurned for the sole reason that they have been written by suspect persons. This also leads to the slander of Holy Writ, as suspect persons may well write works founded on the Bible.[73]
3. Treatises are often condemned before they have been read and diligently studied. This is what happened to the works of Hus, Luther, Oecolampadius "und andern meer büchlen von des Herren brot und weyn schreybent".[74]

The preface reflects contemporary discussions in Germany on the standard of the preaching of the Gospels.[75] In March 1523 the Diet of Nuremberg had ordered that "only the Gospel in accordance with the Scriptures" ("allein das heilig evangelium nach auslegung der schriften") was allowed to be preached. In an earlier draft, however, it had been proposed to follow the writings of the fathers in biblical exegesis; it stipulated that the clergy should preach "allain die evangelia nach auslegung der 4 ewangellisten", that is, in accordance with the works of Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine and Gregory the Great. This draft, staunchly defended by Christoph von Stadion, bishop of Augsburg, was, however, not adopted in the end, but some still explained the final mandate in these terms.

The spiritual climate of the Augsburg circle was similar to that of the Worms circle around Schöffer's printing business.[76] From the autumn of 1525 till the autumn of 1526 Hans Denck stayed in Augsburg and published several treatises with Ulhart. His best friend, Ludwig Hätzer, lived in the house of the Augsburg printer Silvan Otmar, and we recall that Gnapheus's martyrology of Pistorius ended with a short eyewitness

---

[72] *Ein Christlicher bericht von dem Brot vnd weyn desz Herren*, A2recto–A3verso.

[73] *Ein Christlicher bericht von dem Brot vnd weyn des Herren*, A3verso–A4recto.

[74] *Ein Christlicher bericht von dem Brot vnd weyn des Herren*, A4recto–A4verso.

[75] See C. Augustijn, '*Allein das heilig Evangelium*: Het mandaat van het Reichsregiment 6 maart 1523', NAK 48 (1967–1968) 150–165.

[76] See also Schottenloher, *Philipp Ulhart*, pp. 63, 90.

account by Hätzer, but the precise nature and extent of the contacts between the two circles can no longer be determined. The author of the preface succeeded in securing his own anonymity. This assessment of his intellectual milieu is more useful than any speculation about his possible identity,[77] because it shows that Hoen's ideas ultimately found warm support in Anabaptist circles.

The distribution of Hoen's treatise in five editions during two years is indicative of its seminal importance and impact.[78] A description of its distribution by Hinne Rode on his travels to Germany and Switzerland allows for a more precise assessment of its reception and influence.

---

[77] Not entirely unexpectedly, Kaufmann *vermutet* that Martin Bucer was the author of the preface as well (*Die Abendmahlstheologie der Strassburger Reformatoren bis 1528*, pp. 364–365, note 530).

[78] For the sake of completeness, I list all later translations.

1. Trigland's Dutch translation of Hoen's treatise in his *Kerckelijcke Geschiedenisse* (1650).
2. The re-edition of this translation in Ursinus's *Schatboeck* as edited by Joannes Spiljardus (1664, 1694, 1736).
3. A Dutch translation of Eekhof's facsimile edition was made by R. van Deemter and published in 1943. Although Finsler's critical edition with Köhler's introduction had appeared in 1927, Deemter worked from Eekhof's edition and with approval summarized the latter's introduction. His translation leans heavily towards Trigland's. R. van Deemter, 'De Avondmaalsbrief van Cornelis Hoen (1525)', *Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift* 44 (1943) 161–171.
4. A partial reproduction of the text as given by Finsler with Dutch translation was published by the Lutheran church historian W.J. Kooiman in the collection *Documenta Reformatoria*, 2 vols. (Kampen, 1960–1962), I, pp. 33–36.
5. An English translation by Paul L. Nyhus was published in Heiko A. Oberman, *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought illustrated by Key Documents* (New York, 1966; repr. Philadelphia, 1981), pp. 268–278. Though it places the caesura between the text and the additions in the wrong place, translates *ostium* ('door') as sacrifice and transfers Hoen's reference to Erasmus to the footnotes, the translation is vivid and makes the text more easily accessible.
6. A fourth Dutch translation was published by the Reformed professor J. Kamphuis in 1967; it formed part of a series of articles on Hoen, which were collected in 1973: J. Kamphuis, 'De Avondmaalsbrief van Cornelis Hoen', in Kamphuis, *Altijd met goed accoord* (Amsterdam, 1973), pp. 59–84, at pp. 64–73. Kamphuis, somewhat predictably, reached the conclusion that Trigland in his opposition to the Remonstrants had rightly appealed to Hoen.
7. A reproduction in German of some essential passages of Hoen's letter can be found in Heiko A. Oberman, ed., *Die Kirche im Zeitalter der Reformation*. Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte in Quellen, 3 (Neukirchen–Vluyn, 1981; repr. 1985), pp. 144–145.

2. *Hinne Rode's travels*

The diffusion of Hoen's treatise abroad, in Germany and Switzerland, is intimately connected with the career of his friend from Utrecht, Hinne Rode.[79] As the evidence about his life is also scanty, it is hard to write a detailed biographical portrait. No texts bearing his name have come down to us, though his humanist friend Gerardus Geldenhouwer listed Rode among those who wrote *in causa Lutheri*.[80] Rode's name is mentioned in an appendix, drawn up by the duke of Alva, to the Index of Trent, but 'Henricus Rodus' is classified there under the *prima classis*, which lists the names of heretics *ex professo* (heretics who deliberately propagated non-conformist opinions), without, however, summing up their writings.[81] The first fact which is known for certain about Rode's life is that he was rector of the Utrecht Brotherhouse around 1520. No information about his youth and education has been preserved.[82] From the composition of his later circle of friends and his language ("which is predominantly western in character") it has been inferred that he was born in Utrecht or Holland and most probably in the last decade of the fifteenth century.[83] His acquaintance in later years with various representatives of a circle of scholars from Deventer may indicate that he attended its famous Latin school, which in the period between 1481–1498 was under the rectorate of Alexander Hegius and then of Johannes Oostendorp, canon of St Lebuin's church. If this supposition is correct, Rode must have first tasted the *studia humanitatis* before his ordination as a priest and his settling in Utrecht. According to an old

[79] On Rode, see C.C. de Bruin, 'Hinne Rode', in C. Dekker *et alii*, edd., *Het Sticht van binnen en van buijtenen. Bundel opstellen over de geschiedenis van de provincie Utrecht, aangeboden aan Dr. M.P. van Buijtenen bij diens zeventigste verjaardag* (Utrecht, 1981), pp. 191–208; for a few additions with a treatment of the diffusion of Hoen's letter, see Spruyt, 'Hinne Rode (c. 1480–c. 1539): het leven en de ontwikkeling van de dissidente Rector van het Utrechtse fraterhuis'. Otto Clemen, 'Hinne Rode in Wittenberg, Basel, Zürich und die frühesten Ausgaben Wesselscher Schriften', summarized and discussed in the first chapter, remains very valuable; for the printing history of Wessel Gansfort's writings in the 1520s, see also C. Augustijn, 'Wessel Gansfort's Rise to Celebrity', pp. 3–21.

[80] Geldenhauer, *Collectanea*, p. 138.

[81] Christiaan Sepp, *Verboden lectuur. Een drietal Indices librorum prohibitorum toegelicht* (Leiden, 1889), p. 162.

[82] M. van Rhijn, 'De dogmenhistorische achtergrond van Wessel Gansfort's avondmaalsleer', p. 89, mentions Heinrich Rode (born 1405) from Marburg, a sympathizer with the Devotio Moderna, and asks whether Hinne and Heinrich Rode might possibly be relatives.

[83] De Bruin, 'Hinne Rode', pp. 203–204.

tradition, Rode combined his rectorate of the Brotherhouse with the rectorate of the Hieronymus school (the school of the Brethren of the Common Life in Utrecht). R.R. Post, however, has rightly cast doubt on this current opinion. In a passage from a source of 1522 (discussed in greater detail below) 'Johannes Roy' is called only *Rector domus clericorum in Traiecto*, while a combination of two rectorates is highly improbable. In Gnapheus's description of Pistorius's martyrdom, Rode is indeed called the latter's *praeceptor* and is described as *Hieronymiani collegii praefectus*, but the word *collegium*, according to Post, "in this period refers more to a communal dwelling-house than to a school".[84]

In Utrecht, as elsewhere, the Brotherhouse offered lodgings to the pupils of the Latin school connected with it, and the *fratres* made it their task to counsel and educate these young people spiritually.[85] Thus Rode was able to influence pupils of the Hieronymus school; in what spirit he did so becomes abundantly clear from the fact that Pistorius was initiated into the new doctrine by Rode. Gnapheus in his martyrology characterized Rode as an erudite and pious man, who had taught Pistorius the first principles of reform-minded humanism to such an extent that Pistorius's father saw fit to withdraw his son from Rode's influence and send him to Louvain. His humanist education may have made Rode adopt a critical attitude towards the institutions and doctrines of the traditional church, while the study of writings by Erasmus and Luther may have strengthened and intensified his dissent. Utrecht had seen an earlier case of heresy and many more heresy trials enlivened its scene during these years.[86] Rode, moreover, maintained contacts with the court of Philip of Burgundy, the bishop of Utrecht, to which Geldenhouwer was attached at the time.[87] Philip, a typical Renaissance

---

[84] R.R. Post, *The Modern Devotion: Confrontation with Reformation and Humanism*. SMRT, 3 (Leiden, 1968), pp. 571–575, at p. 575, note 2 (for "Grapheus" read Gnapheus).

[85] See W. Lourdaux, 'Het boekenbezit en het boekengebruik bij de Moderne Devoten', in *Studies over boekenbezit en boekengebruik in de Nederlanden vóór 1600*. Archief- en bibliotheekwezen België/Archives et bibliothèques de Belgique, extra no. 11 (Brussels, 1974), pp. 247–325, at pp. 274–275.

[86] See Spruyt, 'Hinne Rode', pp. 23–26; L. van Tongerloo, 'Pastoors in veelvoud', in Ten Boom *et alii*, edd., *Utrechters entre-deux*, pp. 75–111, at pp. 79–81; R.H. Pegel, 'Prediking voor de leken in de stad Utrecht', in Ten Boom *et alii*, edd., *Utrechters entre-deux*, pp. 112–146.

[87] On Philip of Burgundy, see J. Sterk, *Philips van Bourgondië (1465–1524), bisschop van Utrecht, als protagonist van de Renaissance. Zijn leven en maecenaat* (Zutphen, 1980); Sterk does not mention Rode. In contrast to conventional wisdom, Geldenhouwer was not a secretary to Bishop Philip; see C.A. van Kalveen, *Het bestuur van bisschop en Staten in het Nedersticht, Oversticht en Drenthe, 1483–1520* (Utrecht, 1974), pp. 323–324.

prince whose patronage gave a strong impetus to the arts of painting and sculpture according to Italian models, was probably indifferent to the Reformation.[88] The humanist Geldenhouwer, though he did not openly reveal himself as a convinced adherent of the Reformation until the autumn of 1525, had already become very interested in the *causa Lutheri* during his stay at Philip's court: he not only diligently studied writings by Luther and other Reformers, but also treatises by their opponents.[89] A remark by the seventeenth-century historian Schoockius is also important, revealing that Rode and Geldenhouwer were friends and that Rode was a highly esteemed guest at court. What the "learned and pious" rector and his humanist friend discussed at the bishop's court or at his castle of Duurstede has not been transmitted, but the *bonae litterae* and the case of reform were undoubtedly the main subjects of their conversations.[90] Rode's reform-minded sympathies somehow became known: in 1522 he was fired as rector of the Brotherhouse. The author of the chronicles of the Doesburg Brotherhouse reported discord in the Deventer Brotherhouse which had arisen between those upholding the old traditions and those who adhered to the new doctrine. He added that in Utrecht "Iohannes Roy" had been removed from his office *propter Luterum*. Additionally, Gnapheus's martyrology discloses that Rode at this time travelled regularly to Germany for the sake of "the truth of the Gospels".[91] Rode's travels are more elaborately discussed by Albert Hardenberg in his *Vita Wesseli Groningensis*. In the last part of this chapter Hardenberg's report will be compared with primary sources in order to assess as precisely as possible when, where and

---

[88] See Sterk, *Philips van Bourgondië (1465–1524), bisschop van Utrecht*, pp. 62–63.

[89] See C. Augustijn, 'Gerard Geldenhouwer und die religiöse Toleranz', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 69 (1978) 132–156, at pp. 134–135.

[90] Martinus Schoockius, *Liber de bonis vulgo ecclesiasticis dictis* (Groningen, 1651), p. 497: "Rodius, pater domus Hieronymianae, vir doctus et pius, ad hoc amicus Gerardi Geldenhaurii […], nec quondam ingratus in aula Philippi Burgundi."

[91] See W. Moll, 'Aanteekeningen van een tijdgenoot, betreffende de opkomende Hervorming en hare verbreiding, inzonderheid in het fraterhuis te Doesburg', *Kerkhistorisch archief* 3 (1862) 108–115, at p. 111; now in A.G. Weiler, ed., *Necrologie, kroniek en cartularium c.a. van het fraterhuis te Doesburg (1432–1559)*. Kerkhistorische bijdragen, 4 (Leiden, 1974), p. 99; and Fredericq IV, p. 408: "Hic [that is, in Utrecht–BJS] praeceptore vtitur [Pistorius] Ioanne Rhodio, percelebri Hieronymiani collegii praefecto, viro cum docto tum pio, a quo pietatis et religionis nostrae praecepta studiose didicit, professionisque suae tyrocinia sedulo exercuit; inde adeo et cum praeceptore suo studiosus discipulus in Lutheranismi odium statim est vocatus. Coeperat enim per id tempus emergere veritas Euangelica, cui vindicando crebris in Germaniam profectionibus idem Rhodius iam tum vacabat."

to whom Rode showed Hoen's treatise and to establish in what way—if at all—Hoen's ideas influenced his readers.

Through his travels and discussions abroad Rode became a person with more than local or regional significance. Initially active within the city of Utrecht as rector of the Brotherhouse and as a respected interlocutor at the bishop's court, Rode later became acquainted with a circle of dissidents in Holland. On their behalf he travelled to several centres of the Reformation to discuss current theological questions with the reformers active there and to present to them opinions from the Netherlands. His above-average erudition and cogency is particularly revealed by his discussion with Bucer.

After his travels Rode settled in Deventer, where Geldenhouwer visited him following the death of his Maecenas. Geldenhouwer had placed himself in the service of Maximilian of Burgundy but in the autumn of 1525 he set out on a journey to Wittenberg.[92] In Deventer Rode formed part of a circle of prominent individuals, some of whom are known to us by name. Johannes Oostendorp, rector of the Latin school, was still alive. Reform-minded teachers like Johannes Lippius (who would take up the rectorate in 1528) and Gisbertus Longolius (Gijsbert van Langerak, who died in 1543) were attached to his school. Members of the magistracy also belonged to this circle: the town secretary Hermanus van Cothen, Gerardus Mondicenus (van Mouwijck) and Ludolf Hermans, as well as Mayor Jakob van Wijnssen, who in the 1530s would turn up in a circle of Anabaptists. From the Brotherhouse, Georgius Rigenus and Johannes Lydius (who would matriculate in Wittenberg in 1526) are known.[93] In 1525 the Deventer printer Albert Pafraet published a Dutch translation of Luther's September Testament under the title *Dat gants Nyewe Testament recht grondelick verduytschet, met seer geleerden ende richtigen voerreden ende der swaerster plaetsen korte, mer goede verklaring*. According to the colophon, the translation was based on the editions of Luther's translation of the New Testament as published by the Basel printer Adam Petri. C.C. de Bruin established that the reform-minded Deventer individuals who set their minds to translating Luther's High German into Dutch faithfully followed the original, weaving Germanisms into their work but making no correc-

[92] Geldenhouwer, *Collectanea*, p. 79.

[93] De Hoop Scheffer, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland*, pp. 469–472; J.W. Pont, *Geschiedenis van het Lutheranisme in de Nederlanden tot 1618* (Haarlem, 1911), pp. 166–168.

tions or additions. As for their language, the translators (as De Bruin noted) used an idiom which was understandable in both the northern and southern regions of the Low Countries; they aimed for a unity of language beyond differences of dialect and for a reformed language profiting from the richness of Luther's tongue. On 3 December 1525 the Deventer translation of the New Testament was explicitly mentioned in a proclamation by the Kampen magistrates that prohibited all citizens from possessing or printing books by Luther or his disciples, or from organizing heretical meetings.[94] The prologue "To the Christian Reader" reveals that the text was translated by more than one person, for the author of the prologue was assisted in editing the text by "many wise and learned men". De Bruin cautiously assigned a role in the translation and edition of the 1525 Deventer New Testament to Rode; he combined the fact that Rode on his travels had also visited Basel (where he had undoubtedly come to know Adam Petri's editions) with the fact that Rode stayed in Deventer in 1525 to come to his conclusion.

Rode's stay in Deventer lasted only for a short period. At the end of 1525 or early in 1526 he was probably active as an itinerant preacher. In a letter to Zwingli of 9 July 1526 Bucer wrote that through the agency of Rode and others "all Holland and Friesland" had attained the pure insight into the truth and that "all through Flanders, Brabant and Guelders" all Christians were won over to these true opinions.[95] This undoubtedly exaggerated formulation implies only that Rode successfully propagated the new faith in various regions of the Netherlands during these years.

But things must soon have become too hot for Rode. In September 1526 he appears to have fled to East Friesland, where he married.[96] Rode became a preacher in the village of Norden. Very little evidence about his stay in East Friesland has survived. An anonymous and puzzling letter, written to Bucer from Amsterdam on 9 June 1529 reveals that Rode and the Strasbourg reformer had maintained con-

---

[94] Fredericq V, no. 445 (pp. 71–72).

[95] BCor II, ep. 133.23–25: "Tota Holandia et Frysia per Rodium et alios quosdam pure iam sapit; resipiscunt quotquot et per Flandriam, Brabantiam atque Geldriam sunt Christiani" (= Z VIII, pp. 651–654, at p. 652.9–11).

[96] See Wolfgang Capito's letter to Zwingli of 26 September 1526: "Ioannes Rhodius uxorem duxit apud Phrisios. Veritas eucharistiae passim nota est" (Z VIII, pp. 724–725, at p. 725.5–6).

tact with each other.[97] The anonymous writer reported on the colloquy between Melchior Hoffman and Johannes Bugenhagen which had taken place in Flensburg on 8 April 1529, and on the persecutions loosed by Charles of Egmond, the duke of Guelders. In January 1529 Hoffman had invited Andreas Karlstadt to join him and propagate their radical message in Holstein. Karlstadt helped Hoffman to prepare his defence for the Flensburg disputation, but the result of the trial was their expulsion from Holstein. They fled to East Friesland, where they visited Rode in Emden. The anonymous author of the letter told Bucer about the difficult situation the reform-minded dissidents of Amsterdam found themselves in, and asked Bucer to pray for them. Remarkably, the writer of the letter not only speaks about *fratres nostril* in this connection, but also about *nostrae ecclesiae*; the use of the word *ecclesia* seems to point to the existence of counter churches in Amsterdam (and the writer was probably hinting not just at Amsterdam) even before 1530. Prior to the rise of Anabaptism groups of believers apparently institutionalised themselves independently of the traditional church and administered the sacraments at their meetings. The only further evidence of such a situation before 1530 is supplied by a letter of the Antwerp dissident Leonardus Munssoor of 12 September 1531, writing to Luther that certain non-conforming circles from Antwerp had not only gathered in *conuenticula*, but had also celebrated the Lord's Supper.[98] Generally, during the 1520s secret gatherings did not replace Catholic worship; reading and discussing the Bible and religious literature were supplementary to it. But perhaps the writer of the letter to Bucer only used the word *ecclesia* in order to avoid the pejorative word *conuenticula*.[99]

At the beginning of his letter the author wrote that he would enclose a letter by Rode, who was active in Emden at the time: "vbi Rodius noster apostolus agit". In that letter Rode would inform Bucer about his activities in East Friesland. Unfortunately, Rode's letter has not

---

[97] J.V. Pollet, *Martin Bucer: Études sur les relations de Bucer avec les Pays-Bas, l'Électorat de Cologne et l'Allemagne du Nord, avec de nombreux textes inédits*, 2 vols. Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought, 33–34 (Leiden, 1985), II, pp. 3–7; Pollet's ascription of the letter to Georgius Saganus is fairly arbitrary.

[98] WA BR VI, p. 190: "Consueuimus antehac secreta celebrare conuenticula et sic cenam Domini celebrare." See also B.J. Spruyt, 'Humanisme, Evangelisme en Reformatie in de Nederlanden, 1520–1530', in M. van Campen and W. de Greef, edd., *Reformatie in meervoud. Congresbundel 1990* (Kampen, 1991), pp. 39–40 and p. 52, note 120.

[99] Suggestion by Professor C. Augustijn, Amsterdam.

come down to us. Nevertheless, the anonymous letter reveals that in 1529 Rode was not only in contact with Bucer, but also with radical dissident circles in the Netherlands which probably cherished more radical views than Rode is known to have propagated before: his unknown confidant sympathized with Melchior Hoffman, was inclined to glamorize the *via crucis* (in any case he valued sufferings positively)[100] and wrote spiritualistically about the relationship between Christ and the soul.

In general, the East Frisian climate of thought at the time was distinctly spiritualistic, finding expression in texts like the *Hovet Artikelen des hylligen Sacraments bloedes unde vleesches Jesu Christi* (1526) by Georgius Aportanus (Jurgen von Dare) from Emden,[101] *Eyn schoen Christelick ledt van den hochwerdigen Nachtmal Christi Jesu* (1527) by Heinrich Reese from Norden[102] and the *Oostfriese belijdenis* (*The Confession of the East Frisian Preachers*) of 1528.[103] In his letter to Zwingli of September 1526, Capito suggested a relationship between Rode's presence in East Friesland and the spread there of the *veritas eucharistiae*. More or less in line with this, Ernst Koch in 1918 argued that Hinne Rode had introduced the Dutch conception of the Lord's Supper as formulated by Hoen and others into East Friesland.[104] But Hoen's interpretation of the Eucharist

---

[100] See also Trapman, 'Ioannes Sartorius (ca. 1500–1557), gymnasiarch te Amsterdam en te Noordwijk, als erasmiaan en spiritualist', NAK 70 (1990) 30–51, at pp. 46–50, who notices analogous (but later) ideas with the aforementioned Sartorius, whose ideas Trapman connects with those of Sebastian Franck.

[101] Eduard Meiners, *Oostvrieschlandts kerkelijke geschiedenisse*, 2 vols. (Groningen, 1738), I, pp. 114–131; see also Emil Sehling, ed., *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts* VII/ii/1 (Tübingen, 1963), p. 314, note 20.

[102] Meiners, *Oostvrieschlandts kerkelijke geschiedenisse* II, pp. 346–349; Sehling, ed., *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts* VII/ii/1, p. 314, note 22.

[103] See E.F. Karl Müller, ed., *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche* (Leipzig, 1903), pp. 930–935; Sehling, ed., *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts* VII/ii/1, p. 314, note 23. An English translation of the Confession can be found in James Tanis, 'East Friesland and the Reformed Reformation', *Calvin Theological Journal* 26 (1991) 313–349, at pp. 339–346.

[104] Ernst Koch, 'Die Anfänge der ostfriesischen Reformation', *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für bildende Kunst und vaterländische Altertümer zu Emden* 19 (1916) 109–273 and 20 (1920) 1–125; 19 (1916), p. 256. See also Menno Smid, *Ostfriesische Kirchengeschichte*. Ostfriesland im Schutze des Deiches, 6 (Pewsum, 1974), p. 126, writing about Jurgen von Dare's *Hovet Artikelen*: "Hier wird eine Abendmahlslehre vertreten, wie sie in ihrem Grundansatz von Cornelis Hoen in Den Haag genauso gelehrt wurde". The thesis was repeated by James Tanis, "East Friesland and the Reformed Reformation", pp. 319–321, typifying Hoen's treatise as one of the backgrounds to the 1528 Confession of the East Frisian Preachers.

differs fundamentally from the spiritualistic notions as formulated in the *Oostfriese belijdenis*. In this confession, signed by all East Frisian preachers, the Lord's Supper is regarded, as by Zwingli, as merely a supper in commemoration of Christ's life and sufferings, as a confession of faith by the partakers and an exercise in fraternal love.[105] Hoen, on the contrary, interpreted the Eucharist as a pledge of Christ's promise of the forgiveness of sins and compared the eucharistic bread with the ring a bridegroom gives to his bride to assure her that he is entirely hers; just as the bridegroom gives himself to his bride, so Christ gives himself to those who are his own by the effective sign of the bread. The thirtieth article of the East Frisian confession even propounds the exact opposite of what Hoen states in his opening lines. It says that the Lord's Supper does not in the least assure a Christian of his being a true Christian and believer; the partaker should be sure about that before he eats the bread and drinks the wine lest he be a cheat and a mocker.[106] Hoen argues that Christ instituted the Eucharist to assure those who are his own of the forgiveness of sins. Koch's position has therefore rightly been criticized by J. Trapman: "A vrai dire, le spiritualisme qui régnait là-bas [in East Friesland] allait plus loin que Hoen ne l'aurait approuvé".[107]

In addition to a spiritualist, Zwinglian current, a strong Lutheran movement was active in East Friesland as well, rising to a dominant position when Count Enno (1505–1540) imposed a Lutheran *Kirchenordnung* on his county after the death of Count Edzard (1462–1528).[108] Enno's interference quite naturally met with the resistance of the Zwinglian preachers. After Enno had approved the *Kirchenordnung* drafted by Johan Timan and Johannes Pelt (both of them originally from Amsterdam, but now active in Bremen) on 13 December 1529, he summoned all preachers to come to Emden on 13 January 1530 to ask their opinion of his *Kirchenordnung*. The next day the Zwinglian preachers submitted a defence against Enno's edict in adherence to the thirteenth article of the Marburg colloquy on the issues of baptism and

---

[105] Müller, ed. *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche*, p. 931.28–32.

[106] Müller, ed., *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche*, p. 933.37–41: "Veel min versekert dat avontmael des heren eenen christen, dat hij een christen mensche is, den gelove hebbe, dan hij moet des tho voren eer hij toten avontmael gaet seker zijn, anders waer hij een bedrieger oft een spotter."

[107] J. Trapman, 'Le rôle des "sacramentaires" des origines de la Réforme jusqu'en 1530 aux Pays-Bas', NAK 63 (1983) 1–24, at p. 21.

[108] Sehling, ed., *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, pp. 360–372.

the Lord's Supper.[109] As Rode is known to have attended the Marburg colloquy as a deputy and as he was among those preachers who were dismissed from their post as a result of Enno's change of course, Rode was very probably among the authors and signers of this petition. The Zwinglian preachers, after assuring their count of their submission and obedience in matters temporal, stressed that they were willing on the preservation of their Christian liberty and a free conscience to accept what the *Ordnung* said about ceremonies and ecclesiastical rites, insofar as its instructions did not contradict Scripture. Here they referred to what had been agreed on this point in Marburg: traditions and human institutions if not contrary to Scripture could be left alone in order to avoid annoyance, to provide love and support to the weak and to further the cause of peace. They added that they wanted freedom to reprove the people's unbelief and false faith in baptism and the Lord's Supper and to encourage them to the true use of these sacraments. They would prefer to refute in a personal interview or public disputation the accusation, repeatedly made, that they had propagated incorrect opinions on the external Word and the sacraments; as yet, they had had to be content with a written defence. They denied ever having taught that the sacraments were without any use; rather they held that they had been instituted by God for the benefit of the congregation. Only through the preaching of the Gospel did God negotiate with mankind. In order to prevent man from trusting external signs or his own works, the Zwinglian preachers emphasized in all their sermons that the external Word should be connected to the internal doctrine of the Father, the external baptism of John the Baptist with the inward baptism of Christ, and the external Supper with the internal partaking of the true flesh and blood of Christ, as the external without the internal had of itself no power at all. Against the idea of the corporeal presence of Christ under or in the bread and wine of the Eucharist, they stated their belief in Christ's sacramental and spiritual presence, but they did not want to quarrel about it. The main content of their doctrine (faith in Christ as the only sufficient link between God and man) had never been condemned and they had never been accused of heresy because of their view of the Eucharist. They urged that the current situation of peaceful coexistence should endure. The example to follow was Marburg, where two opposing parties could not agree

[109] Meiners, *Oostvrieschlandts kerkelijke geschiedenisse* I, pp. 94–98; see also Sehling, ed., *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts*, p. 317, note 49 and p. 339, note 34.

about the interpretation of the Lord's Supper, but still agreed about the necessary articles of faith and decided not to condemn one another as heretics, but to exercise mutual love. On the basis of these arguments the authors of the petition expressed their hope that Count Enno would not pry into their consciences. Their hope, however, proved vain as events took a different course. Enno clung to his Lutheran *Ordnung* and sacked those preachers who resisted it. Rode was among them. He next settled in the small village of Wolthusen near Emden.

Nothing is known about his further activities there, unless Rode can indeed be identified with the Hansz or Johannes Roden mentioned by Van Toorenenbergen. This Roden is mentioned in the trial records of Jürgen Wullenwever (1492–1537), mayor of Lübeck.[110] In December 1535/January 1536 this unfortunate magistrate confessed on the rack that he had summoned Hansz Roden (or "herr Johan") from Holland to meet with him and to discuss the sect of the Anabaptists. On this occasion Roden with the Bible in his hand had exposed "dasz er sich duncken liesse er mochte damit selig warden". According to the interrogation, "herr Johan" was in Lübeck and he stayed there for a considerable length of time with Hieronymus Witzendorf in Lüneburg. As Van Toorenenbergen thought, the reason for "herr Johan's" stay in Lüneburg was obvious, because the East Frisian counts Enno and Johan had turned in 1534 to the ruler of Lüneburg for help in introducing Lutheranism into their county: Rode, then, would have gone to this place to look after the interests of the Zwinglian party.

Information about the circumstances and the year of Rode's death may be deduced from the discussion between the Lutheran Joachim Kükenbieter (Nossiophagus) and Martin Micron in 1557. This controversy, moreover, also clarifies a fairly obscure passage from Hardenberg's *Vita Wesseli*, where Hardenberg writes that Rode had been slandered by certain people, not only during his lifetime, but also after his death. Hardenberg refuted this libel by reminding his readers of the fact that Rode had died full of Christian hope and supported by his

[110] J.J. van Toorenenbergen, 'Hinne Rode (Joh. Rodius), Rector van de Hieronymusschool te Utrecht (– 1522), predikant te Norden (– 1530), in betrekking tot de Anabaptisten', *Archief voor Nederlandse Kerkgeschiedenis* 3 (1889) 90–101; J. Lindeboom, *Het bijbelsch humanisme in Nederland* (Leiden, 1913), p. 160, note 1, summarily dismissed this article by Van Toorenenbergen as "completely useless" ("volkomen van onwaarde"), but did not give any reasons for his judgement.

most certain faith, and that he was buried with the invocation of the Son of God.[111] Hardenberg here referred to the indignities Kükenbieter had inflicted on Rode in 1557. This venomous Lutheran preacher (who died in 1565) had been active in Norden from 1537–1539 and then in Schwerin, where in 1557 he drafted a confession in which he recalled his defence in Norden of the Lutheran conception of the Lord's Supper against the "bloodthirsty sacramentarians and the Anabaptists". He had also witnessed, he wrote, how God's righteous judgement had been visited on Rode: when at the count's order Rode was preparing to leave, he suddenly passed away ("ilico collapsus interiit"). God thus showed his aversion to the *sacramentariorum peruersa doctrina*, Kükenbieter concluded.[112] In his *Apologeticum scriptum*, Martin Micron answered these imputations by reporting Rode's gentle death in Wolthusen after a short illness and after he had consoled his wife (who was still alive in 1557: "quae adhuc superstes viuit"), his parishioners and his colleague Antonius Sleenbusz.[113] Micron did not reveal anything about the year of Rode's death, but it can be inferred from Kükenbieter's confession that Rode died during the former's stay in Norden, that is, in the period between 1537–1539.

Not all the details of Hardenberg's report on Hinne Rode's travels to Germany and Switzerland in the early 1520s can be substantiated by primary sources. Otto Clemen, therefore, though he had thoroughly examined the printing history of Wessel's writings and Rode's travels and had asserted that Hardenberg's *Vita* was in many respects trustworthy, later described his findings as an "Erstlingsaufsatz" and no longer considered Hardenberg's *Vita* to be a reliable historical source.[114] Nevertheless, Clemen's rigid point of view is not compelling.

Rode's travels are connected with the printing history of Wessel Gansfort's writings, which were published by the Zwolle *Officina Corveri-*

---

[111] Albert Hardenberg, *Vita Wesseli Groningensis*, in Wessel Gansfort, *Opera* (Groningen, 1614; repr. Nieuwkoop, 1966), fol. **–***2verso, at fol. **7verso.

[112] J.J. ten Doornkaat Koolman, 'Joachim Kükenbieter (Nossiophagus), ein lutherischer Eiferer des Reformationszeitalters', NAK 44 (1961) 157–176.

[113] Marten Micron, *Apologeticum scriptum* (Emden, 1557), pp. 41–43 (copy extant in Utrecht University Library: Rariora Theol. Oct. 415).

[114] C. Augustijn appears to share Clemen's final opinion, writing that "we have no means of ascertaining a possible historical germ of truth" in Hardenberg's story and asking whether there may be "after all an element of truth in Hardenberg's story about the travels of Hinne Rode": 'Wessel Gansfort's Rise to Celebrity', pp. 10–11, 13.

ana as well as in Basel and Wittenberg during the period 1520–1523.[115] After Hoen and his friends had found treatises by Wessel and the *vetus scriptum*, they succeeded in persuading Rode to take them with him to seek the judgment of German and Swiss reformers. Master Wouter, who in 1520 had moved from Utrecht, their common place of residence, to Delft, may have drawn their attention to the Utrecht rector, or Pistorius may have mentioned his name to Hoen and his friends (though Pistorius's contacts with the Delft–The Hague circle are not documented until 1523). Of the visits mentioned by Hardenberg, those to Oecolampadius and Zwingli (and to Bucer in Strasbourg, not described by Hardenberg) are not subject to doubt. His visit to Luther, however, is not documented by any direct primary sources. Still, there are enough indications which, when taken together, make Rode's stay in Wittenberg highly plausible. Before April 1522 six texts by Wessel were published under the title *Farrago*; the printer was the younger Melchior Lotter. The Zwolle edition of 1521/1522 by Simon Corver underlies this Wittenberg edition.[116] The humanist Gerardus Listrius, rector of the Zwolle Latin school, was attached to Corver's office as the selector and editor of the texts to be printed by Corver.[117] As, according to Hardenberg, the Zwolle printings were related to Rode's activities as

[115] See Augustijn, 'Wessel Gansfort's Rise to Celebrity', p. 22, for a scheme of the printing history of Wessel's texts. Augustijn discusses the history in detail and provides references to the bibliographical literature. For the sake of completeness, I mention A. Hyma, 'Hoen's Letter on the Eucharist and its Influence upon Carlstadt, Bucer and Zwingli', *Princeton Theological Review* 24 (1926) 124–131.

[116] Clemen in WA X/2, p. 315, assumed that the two editions were based on different manuscripts, both deriving from one original, but see Augustijn, 'Wessel Gansfort's Rise to Celebrity', p. 11, note 42. On the Zwolle printer Simon Corver, see M.E. Kronenberg, 'Iets over een onbekend Novum Testamentum, in Sept. 1522 te Amsterdam uitgegeven, en over de drukkerij van Corver', *Het Boek* 15 (1926) 241–256; M.E. Kronenberg, *Verboden boeken en opstandige drukkers in de hervormingstijd* (Amsterdam, 1948), pp. 67–74; M.E. Kronenberg, 'Simon Corver in de gevangenis (1536)', *Het Boek* 30 (1949–1951) 313–317 (reprinted in M.E. Kronenberg, *Over mensen en boeken* [The Hague, 1961], pp. 109–113); A. Haga, 'Nieuws over Simon Corver', *Het Boek* 37 (1965–1966) 209–211; I.H. van Eeghen, 'De "Officina Corveriana", de eerste internationale uitgever in Amsterdam', *Jaarboek Amstelrodamum* 78 (1986) 54–75.

[117] Corver mentioned Listrius's services in his *Ad clerum Amsterdamum elegia* (repr. in Kronenberg, 'Iets over een onbekend Novum Testamentum', pp. 255–256) and Listrius's distich ("Discite, discendi quando est occasio, spreta / Nam fugit, et tristis vos metanoea coquet") is printed in several editions by Corver. On Listrius, see B.J. Spruyt, 'Listrius *lutherizans*: his *Epistola theologica aduersus Dominicanos Suollenses*', *Sixteenth Century Journal* 22 (1991) 727–751, and B.J. Spruyt, ed., 'Gerardus Listrius' *Epistola theologica aduersus Dominicanos Suollenses*', NAK 71 (1991) 224–244.

well, Rode must have first made contact with the *auctor intellectualis* of Corver's printing office, which in the period between 1519–1523 "developed itself into one of the most active producers of heretical books".[118] Luther's recommendation of Wessel's treatises of 30 July (1522; also mentioned by Hardenberg) was not yet included in the Wittenberg edition of the *Farrago*; it was printed for the first time in the Zwolle edition of letters by Wessel with Anthonius de Castro's *Impugnatorium* (1522). Evidently, then, somebody from Zwolle had asked Luther for a contribution to the publication of some of Wessel's texts in Zwolle. Both facts suggest a lively exchange of contacts between Zwolle and Wittenberg, that are already indicative of a sojourn in Wittenberg by Rode. In addition, traces of Hoen's *Epistola* in Wittenberg are demonstrable. From Zwingli's remark to Luther, "und nach dem allem hat uns gott die epistel Honii zugesendt, von dero du wol weist",[119] it might be inferred that Luther indeed saw Hoen's treatise, but this letter dates from 20 June 1527, so Zwingli may have meant the printed edition of Hoen's text. Evidence of Hoen's notoriety in Luther's city is more indirect. In his book *Vom Anbeten des Sacraments des heiligen Leichnams Christi* (April 1523) Luther refuted arguments which Hoen had propounded in his *Epistola*. Luther here opposed those who held that mere bread and wine were in the sacrament of the Eucharist and that the bread only signified Christ's body, just as manna signified (*bedeutte*) Christ's body or the Gospel. They who advance this opinion, Luther added, refer in particular to Mt 16,18 (*Tu es petrus et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam*) and to ICor 10,4 (*Petra autem erat Christus*).[120] Hoen, as we have seen, had indeed referred to these texts to substantiate his interpretation of *hoc est corpus meum* as *hoc significat corpus meum*. Although Luther, writing in his *Vom Anbeten des Sacraments* about "etlich" who supported this interpretation, nowhere explicitly warned against Hoen's letter, he reduced "etlich" to two people in his *Eyn brieff an die Christen zu Straspurg wider den Schwermer Geyst* of the following year, without, however, mentioning their names. In reply to Karlstadt's opinion, based according to Luther on the distorted exegesis that only bread and wine are in the Eucharist, he wrote:

> Ich habe auch zween gehabt, die geschickter davon zu myr geschrieben haben denn D. Carlstad und nicht also die wordt gemartert nach eyge-

[118] Kronenberg, *Verboden boeken en opstandige drukkers*, p. 68.
[119] Z V, pp. 907.9–908.4.
[120] WA XI, pp. (417)431–456 and 487–488, at p. 434.5–31.

> nem dunckel. Aber ich bin gefangen, kan nicht eraus, der text ist zu gewaltig da und will sich nicht lassen aus dem synn reyssen.[121]

The first person who, "geschickter" than Karlstadt, had propounded to Luther a spiritualistic interpretation of the Eucharist, was Franz Kolb, preacher of Wettheim, who in the postscript to his letter of 27 August 1524 had informed Luther about the symbolic interpretation of the Eucharist.[122] No-one else can be identified as one of the two expositors of a spiritualistic interpretation to Luther, and hence Hoen, tentatively, may be established as the second one. This suggestion is all the more plausible when it is considered that Hoen's exposition was demonstrably influenced by Luther's *De captiuitate Babylonica* of October 1520, which is one of the reasons why, for Hoen, Luther must have been the theologian "apud quem omne iudicium sacrae scripturae fuit". But in addition, the works of Luther's earlier supporter, Andreas Bodenstein of Karlstadt, bear traces of an acquaintance with Hoen's writing. In his *Von beyden gestalten der heylige Messze* of November 1521, Karlstadt still opposed the "figurliche ausslegung" of the words of institution, characterizing this interpretation explicitly as a "frembde(n) expositionen" which had recently reached Wittenberg—an allusion, it seems, to a recent unsympathetic encounter with these views in Wittenberg, which may reflect Rode's visit and Luther's subsequent spurning of Hoen's symbolic interpretation.[123] Another indication of the notoriety of Hoen's treatise in Wittenberg at the time is given by some passages in Karlstadt's *Dialogus oder gesprechsbüchlein* (1524; before 9 November), which prove that Karlstadt had in the meantime—that is, before its

---

[121] WA XV, pp. (380)391–397, at p. 394.17–20.

[122] WA BR III, pp. 329–332, at p. 332; see also WA XV, p. 384.

[123] Karlstadt, *Von beiden Gestalten der heiligen Messe. Von Zeichen in gemein, was sie wirken und deuten* (Wittenberg: Nickel Schirlentz, [November–December] 1521), D2verso: "Allhie will ich nicht schweigen, das ettliche die zeichen heyliger schrifft trutzlich ausslegen, unnd sind nicht gnugtig an ausslag der schrifft, sonder machen new erklerung. Ich will aber mein gewissen bewaren, dan ich weiss das mir nit czimmet ettwas zu der schrifft zusetzen, so ist auch solche kecke ausslegung, nitt fast loblich, gibbt ursach der leychtfertigkeit […] So schleüsset auch käyn figurliche ausslegung, sie wer dan in der Biblien begriffen […] Wir sollen auch solche arbeit besser anlegen, dann wir haben on das, sonst mit der Biblien genug zu thun, und ist unnötlich, das wir uns mit *frembden expositionen* bekumern, und die zeit vorlieren, sonderlich weil uns nit erlaubt ist, etwas zu göttlichen worten anzusetzen, aber davon zunemen." The passage was pointed out by Ulrich Bubenheimer, '*Scandalum et ius divinum*: Theologische und rechtstheologische Probleme der ersten reformatorischen Innovationen in Wittenberg 1521/22', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* 90 (1973) 263–342, at p. 278, note 56; see also p. 282, note 67.

publication—become acquainted with Hoen's *Epistola*. In his refutation of the *praesentia realis* Karlstadt appealed to Mt 24,23, which text—as has become sufficiently clear by now—is a distinctive characteristic of Hoen's treatise. Moreover, in this treatise Karlstadt "tortured" (so said Luther) the text *hoc est corpus meum* by arguing that Christ pronounced these words while pointing not at the bread and wine, but to his own physical body, which evidently recalls Hoen's exegesis of Mt 16,18, according to which Christ pronounced *se demonstrans* the words *Supra hanc petram*.[124] This treatise was a response to Luther's challenge at the Inn of the Black Bear in Jena to write against his interpretation of the Eucharist,[125] an event Hardenberg alluded to when describing Rode's visit to Wittenberg, though he erred in the date. Incited to do so by the Strasbourg preachers, Luther replied to Karlstadt's expositions in his *Ein Brief an die Christen zu Strassburg* (December 1524) and in his *Wider die himmlischen Propheten* (December 1524/January 1525).[126]

All these indications seem enough to suggest the trustworthiness of the main points of Hardenberg's information about Rode's sojourn in

---

[124] See Erich Hertz, ed., *Karlstadts Schriften aus den Jahren 1523–1525*, 2 vols. Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts, 325 (Halle, 1957), II, pp. 5–49, at p. 17.2–5 ("Ich hab es stets vff die weyse geschatzt das Christus vff seinen leyb hab gedeut, vnnd also gesagt, 'diss ist der leyb meyn der für euch gegeben würt'") and p. 42.27–34 ("Nym Christus wort der also saget, 'Wenn sie sagen hie ist Christus, dort ist Christus' (als ir paffen ein lang zeyt gethan vvnd gesagt habt, inn der hostien ist Christus, vnnd in ihener hostien, vnd in allen winckeln ist Christus) 'so solt ir nicht hinaus gehen, noch glauben, denn Christus zukunft wirt nicht heimlich sein sondern so scheynbarlich vnnd sichtiglich als der blicks der von auffgang bis zum nidergang scheynet'"). For more bibliographical information about the *Dialogus oder ein Gesprächsbüchlein: Von dem greulichen, abgöttischen Missbrauch des hochwürdigsten Sakraments Jesu Christi*, see no. 67 in Alejandro Zorzin's 'Chronologisch geordnetes Verzeichnis der gedruckten Schriften des Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt', an unpaginated appendix to his *Karlstadt als Flugschriftenautor* (Göttingen, 1990). For Luther's refutation of Karlstadt's appeal to Mt 24,23, see WA XVIII, 211.6–12 and WA XXVI, 423.37–424.23. Gordon Rupp's statement that Karlstadt's acquaintance with Hoen's *Epistola* is not "likely" needs to be revised: *Patterns of Reformation* (London, 1969), pp. 47–153, at p. 142.

[125] Expelled from Orlamünde, Karlstadt published seven treatises at the end of October or early in November 1524, which caused much confusion in Zurich and Strasbourg, but which eventually won the essential support of the reformers active there (see *infra*). On these treatises, see also Hermann Barge, 'Zur Chronologie und Drucklegung der Abendmahlsschriften Karlstadts', *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekwesen* 21 (1904) 323–331 and WA XVIII, pp. 37–39. The Jena discussion was described by Martin Reinhardt: WA XV, pp. 323–347.

[126] WA XVIII, pp. 62–125; the writings of this period of Karlstadt's life are discussed in Zorzin, *Karlstadt als Flugschriftenreformator*, pp. 101–105.

Wittenberg, the publication of Wessel's works, the notoriety of Hoen's text there, and the occasion it gave to the quarrel between Luther and Karlstadt on the Eucharist.

If this argument is accepted, we may further conclude that although Luther regarded Hoen's exposition as such as "geschickt" while nevertheless rejecting it unconditionally, the text provided Karlstadt with arguments which became the basis for the first rift between the Reformers on the Eucharist.

As Luther stayed at the Wartburg from 2 April 1521, and not in Wittenberg, while Hoen compiled his treatise in the winter of 1520–1521, Rode in all probability visited Wittenberg in the early spring of 1521. This date, however, does not exclude the possibility of earlier visits. Is it, in view of what is known about the relationships between Wittenberg and Zwolle, too bold a proposal to think of the *pater Johannes* mentioned by Luther in a letter to Gerardus Listrius of July 1520 and evidently the contact between Luther and Zwolle, as being Hinne Rode?[127]

In January 1523 Rode visited Basel. His presence there was recorded by Johann Oecolampadius in a letter to Kaspar Hedio. He wrote that he had had a conversation with Rode that night and that he had invited him to eat the next day at Cratander's. (Oecolampadius was a proofreader for this Basel printer and lived in his house.) Oecolampadius added that Cratander would print Wessel's writings, if Rode so desired.[128] Although they seem to have discussed the publication of works by Wessel, Cratander never published them. Instead, his Basel colleague Adam Petri re-issued that very same month the *Farrago* which he had printed several months before (in September 1522). Petri's edition, a quarto volume of 264 pages, consisted of a reprint of the Wittenberg edition of the *Farrago* to which were added the Zwolle *Epistolae* by Wessel (De Castro's *Impugnatorium* was left out, but Luther's letter of recommendation was included) and a new epilogue by Ulrich Hugwald, later an Anabaptist. Petri's evident contacts with Zwolle—from where he probably received both volumes, while his edition of Luther's

[127] WA BR II, ep. 316 (pp. 148–150, at p. 148).

[128] See Ernst Staehelin, ed., *Briefe und Akten zum Leben Oekolampads*, 2 vols. Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte, 10, 19 (Leipzig, 1927–1934), I, no. 142 (p. 204): "Rodio Traiectensi […] parum hoc vesperi locutus sum, cras ad prandium Cratandri vocato […] Wesselum si volet Rodius imprimet Cratander" (letter of 21 January 1523).

translation of the New Testament saw a Dutch translation in Deventer in 1525—should come as no surprise. After his studies in Louvain and Pavia, Listrius stayed for some years in Basel, where he worked as a proofreader for Johann Froben (for whom he corrected Erasmus's *Adagia* and added a commentary to Erasmus's *Praise of Folly*)[129] and formed part of the Erasmian *sodalitas Basiliensis*;[130] Listrius thus had good contacts with Basel humanist circles. Petri not only used the Zwolle edition of Wessel's *Epistolae*, but in 1523 also reprinted the *Disputatio Groningae habita*, which Corver had printed earlier that same year.[131] In view of Rode's documented contacts with Corver and Listrius and his apparent contacts with Petri, Oecolampadius's remark about a possible publication of Wessel's texts by Cratander is "mysterious" indeed; it is "hardly conceivable that Oecolampadius was ill-informed or that he confused things".[132] Most likely, Rode showed Oecolampadius treatises by Wessel which Petri had not printed, while Cratander decided not to print these as in his opinion the market had reached saturation point because of Petri's earlier publications.[133]

---

[129] See *Die Amerbachkorrespondenz*, A. Hartmann, ed., II: *1514–1524* (Basel, 1943), ep. 512 (pp. 27–28); Allen, ep. 337.893–895, ep. 641.3–4, ep. 2615.171–181. On Listrius's commentary (which he apparently wrote only partly), see the literature cited in Spruyt, 'Listrius *lutherizans*', p. 734, note 37.

[130] Allen, ep. 305.184–186 (Erasmus to Jacobus Wimpfeling, 21 September 1514): "Item Giraerdus Listrius, medicae rei non vulgariter peritus, ad hec Latinae, Graecae, et Hebraicae literaturae pulchre gnarus, denique ad me amandum natus."

[131] See S.P. Wolfs, *Das Groninger 'Religionsgespräch' (1523) und seine Hintergründe*, pp. 183–185.

[132] Augustijn, 'Wessel Gansfort's Rise to Celebrity', p. 13.

[133] Ever since N. Weiss, 'Le premier traité protestant en langue française: La Summe de l'escripture saincte, 1523', *Bulletin de la société de l'histoire du protestantisme français* 68 (1919) 63–79, it has been assumed that Rode on his visit to Oecolampadius also had the Latin text (allegedly composed by Hoen or by Rode) of the *Summa der godliker scrifturen* with him, and that Guillaume Farel, also then in Basel (from December 1523 as Oecolampadius's housemate), translated it into French and had it published by the Basel printer Thomas Wolff in 1523 (see also Elfriede Jacobs, *Die Sakramentslehre Wilhelm Farels*. Zürcher Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte, 10 [Zürich, 1978], p. 49, who states that since "N. Weiss die Hypothese vorgetragen hat, dass Farel der Verfasser der Summe sein könnte, diese Annahme von der Farel-Forschung als Faktum übernommen worden [ist]"). But this *Summe de lescripture saincte*, though its colophon pretends it was printed in Basel in 1523 ("Imprimé à Basle par Thomas Wolff. Lan mil cinq cens vingt et trios"), was actually printed ca. 1534 by Simon du Bois in Alençon (see George Clutton, 'Simon du Bois of Paris and Alençon', *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch* 1937, pp. 124–130; Francis Higman, 'Dates-clé de la Réforme française: la Sommaire de Guillaume Farel et la Somme de l'escripture saincte', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 38 [1976] 237–247; Jacobs, *Die Sakramentslehre Wilhelm Farels*, pp. 49–53): the publication of a French translation of the *Summa*, then, has no connection with Rode's visit to Basel.

Hoen's treatise is not mentioned here; did Rode show it to his Basel hosts? Early in 1526 Cratander printed a German translation of Hoen's treatise, but this publication is a reprint of the 1525 Strasbourg edition.[134] The question of whether or not Oecolampadius's shift which took place around this time (after January 1523 he no longer held to Christ's corporeal presence in the Eucharist)[135] was influenced by his reading of Hoen's letter must, therefore, remain open. Neither can anything be inferred from Oecolampadius's *De genuina verborum Domini: Hoc est corpus meum, iuxta vetustissimos authores expositione liber*, printed by Johann Knobloch in Strasbourg in July 1525. Though in it he criticized transubstantiation as contrary to biblical miracles and also appealed to Mt 24,23 to refute the doctrine of the *praesentia realis*[136]—which might indicate his acquaintance with Hoen's ideas—in 1525 Bucer and his Strasbourg colleagues believed, and said so, that they had derived this argument from Karlstadt's writings, who had advanced it in the autumn of 1524.[137] At the end of 1524 Rode would return to Basel, but this second (?) stay is only mentioned in a letter by Bucer (see below) and not otherwise documented.

The same holds true, probably, for the Dutch translation of *Das Testament Jesu Christi das man bysher genent hat dye Mesz*, a text with directions for the faithful in partaking of the Lord's Supper, printed in 1523 under the name of Oecolampadius (see Ernst Staehelin, *Oekolampad-Bibliographie* [Basel, 1918; repr. Nieuwkoop, 1963], no. 85; the text is available in Julius Smend, ed., *Die evangelischen deutschen Messen bis zu Luthers Deutscher Messe* [Göttingen, 1896], pp. 49–71); Rode, it was thought, took this text back to the Netherlands, where it was translated. However, this Dutch translation (for the text, see J.J. van Toorenenbergen, ed., *Het oudste Nederlandsche verboden boek, 1523* [Leiden, 1882], pp. 194–200) was not published as an appendix to the *Summa der godliker scrifturen* until 1528, when Willem Vorsterman of Antwerp printed it, while a separate edition of *Dat Testament Jesu Christi* is mentioned for the first time in the 1531 catalogue of the library of Jan vander Haar, and in 1535 in the acts of the trial of the Amsterdam Anabaptist Rem Peterssen (see Trapman, 'Le rôle des "sacramentaires"', pp. 10–14).

[134] See Pegg, *A Catalogue of Reformation Pamphlets in Swiss Libraries*, no. 277; the copy extant in the Kantonsbibliothek of Chur now seems to be lost. That this edition was a reprint of the Strasbourg translation I conclude from their identical title.

[135] See Ernst Staehelin, *Das theologische Lebenswerk Johannes Oekolampads*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte, 21 (Leipzig, 1939), pp. 269–270.

[136] Cited by Staehelin, *Das theologische Lebenswerk Johannes Oekolampads*, p. 282.

[137] BCor I, ep. 83.45–55; see also BCor I, ep. 81.52–53. In his exposition on miracles in *De genuina verborum Dei expositione* Oecolampadius repeated arguments which he had already advanced in an annotation to his edition of *Diui Joannis Chrysostomi Psegmata quaedam* (March 1523) and would still voice in 1530; see Staehelin, *Das theologische Lebenswerk Johannes Oekolampads*, pp. 174, 278, 623.

After his visit to Basel, Rode is recorded as having stayed in Zurich. His companion was Georgius Saganus, about whose identity nothing is known. Rode's sojourn there must have taken place between 2 February or 15 June 1523 and 16 November 1524.[138] None of the sources relative to this stay say a word about Wessel's treatises, but they are informative about the relationship between Hoen and Zwingli. In his response of 23 October 1525 to Bugenhagen's letter to Hess (*Ad Ioannis Bugenhagii Pomerani epistolam reponsio*), Zwingli wrote that for some time he had realized that the words *hoc est corpus meum* should be interpreted tropically, but he did not know in which word the trope was hidden (*in qua voce tropus lateret*). Then—thanks to God's grace—"two pious and erudite men" (whose names he still concealed) visited him and Leo Jud to discuss the true interpretation of the Eucharist. After Zwingli had explained his opinion, these two men thanked God, but were reluctant to share their own view with Zwingli; they evidently knew that at the time it was often dangerous to communicate one's views on this topic to strangers. Instead, they handed him a letter (which, Zwingli wrote, had been published in the meantime) by "a pious and erudite Batavian", in which Zwingli found the precious pearl, *viz*. that *est* should be interpreted as *significat*. In his *De vera et falsa religione commentarius* (published in March 1525), Zwingli continued, he propounded this interpretation openly for the first time.[139] But Zwingli had already advanced

---

[138] 2 February 1523 is the *terminus a quo* as Leo Jud, Zwingli's collaborator, took up his office as *Leutpriester* in Zurich on that date, while Zwingli explicitly stated that Rode and Saganus came "ad Leonem nostrum et me" (Z IV, p. 560.21–24; Georg Finsler, ed., *Die Chronik des Bernhard Wyss* [Basel, 1901], p. 21); the *terminus ad quem* is 16 November 1524 because at that date Zwingli propounded in his letter to Mattheus Alber for the first time the interpretation of *est* as *significat*. This interpretation, he admitted, he had derived from Hoen's *Epistola*. Eekhof (*De Avondmaalsbrief van Cornelis Hoen*, p. xviii) and Köhler (Z IV, p. 506) thought that Rode came to Zurich after 15 June 1523, as Zwingli in his letter to Thomas Wyttenbach of that date discussed his interpretation of the Lord's Supper, but without indicating any knowledge of Hoen's ideas. W.F. Dankbaar, *Martin Bucers Beziehungen zu den Niederlanden*. Kerkhistorische studiën, 9 (The Hague, 1961), p. 13, note 1, was not convinced by this argument as Zwingli, he wrote, from fear of unrest was most reticent about revealing his true opinions.

[139] Z IV, pp. (546)558–576, at p. 560.18–33: "Sic ergo didicimus, vrgente nos rudium cura, qui non bene norunt, quid tropus significet, quomodo ista vox 'est' debeat pro 'significat' accipi. Videbam *tropikos* dictum esse 'hoc est corpus meum', sed in qua voce tropus lateret, non videbam. Ibi Dei munere factum est, vt duo quidam et pii et docti homines, quorum etiamnum tacebo nomina, ad Leonem nostrum et me conferendi de hoc argumento causa venirent; cumque nostram hac in re sententiam audirent, gratias egerunt Deo (suam enim ipsi celabant, quod tum non erat tutum cuique communicare quod in hac re sentiret), ac epistolam istam cuiusdam et docti et pii Bataui, quae iam

Hoen's view more secretly in a letter to the 'Lutheran' preacher of Reutlingen, Matthäus Alber,[140] who had asked Zwingli for an explanation of the relationship between his views and those of Karlstadt as expressed in the latter's tracts of the autumn of 1524. Zwingli's answer, dated 16 November 1524, circulated among many people (one source mentions more than 500)[141] and was eventually printed in March 1525, simultaneously with the *Commentarius*. Zwingli's treatment of Karlstadt is positive and friendly, largely because Karlstadt had placed great emphasis on faith.[142] Zwingli, however, rejected his view that Christ, when he pronounced the words *hoc est corpus meum*, pointed to his own body.[143] In Zwingli's view, the figure of speech was not and could not

---

excusa est anonyma, soluta sarcina communicarunt. In ea foelicem hanc margaritam 'est' pro 'significat' hic accipi inueni. Cumque hanc sententiam cogeremur in *Commentario* palam exponere, consultius videbatur ipsam vocem in qua tropus latet, adperire sua ista claue quam solummodo dicere: 'Tropus est' Sic igitur docuimus 'est' pro 'symbolum est', 'figura est', 'significat' hic positum esse. "This passage was the source not only of a passage from Lavather, but also, it seems, of Joachim Westphal in his *Collectanea sententiarum diui Aurelii Augustini de coena Domini* (Regensburg, 1555), D2recto, who wrote that Zwingli's interpretation had been invented by a "Batavian" ("inventionem acceptam fert cuidam Batavo"). Prof. Derk Visser, Collegeville, USA, kindly drew my attention to this passage.

On the discussion between Walther Köhler and Karl Bauer on the meaning of the words "Ipse ex Honio Batavo […] per 'est pro significat' expedivi", see the note by Fritz Blanke in Z V, p. 738, note 7. See also Hanns Rückert, 'Das Eindringen der Tropuslehre in die schweizerische Auffassung vom Abendmahl', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 37 (1940) 199–222.

For Zwingli's exposition of the Eucharist in his *Commentarius*, see Z III, pp. (590)628–912, at pp. 773.25–820.17; the tropical, significative interpretation is expounded on pp. 795.9–799.21. Here (p. 795.12–17) Zwingli also claimed to have heard that Wyclif and the Waldensians had already propounded the interpretation of 'est' as 'significat', but he added that he had not seen their scriptural proofs and surmised that, though their interpretation was correct, they had never defended it correctly and that for this reason they had been condemned.

[140] On Alber, see Martin Brecht, 'Matthäus Albers Theologie', *Blätter für die Württembergische Kirchengeschichte* 62 (1962) 63–97.

[141] Z IV, p. 558.23.

[142] Z III, pp. (322)335–354, at p. 343.11–14: "Ego, vt ingenue dicam, hominis laudo industriam, sed multo magis de fide gratulor, qua didicit non alia ratione nos posse salvos reddi quam ea fide qua credimus Christum pro nobis esse passum."

[143] Z III, p. 343.6–11: "Carolostadius in eo libello, quem legimus, vult hic [sc. in the words of consecration—BJS] demonstrationem variari, vt cum dixerit: 'Accepit Iesus panem et benedixit, fregit deditque discipulis suis, dicens: Accipite et comedite! Hoc est corpus meum, quod pro vobis traditur', istud pronomen 'hoc' non in panem direxerit, sed in se ipsum, vt sit sensus: 'Accipite et comedite! nam ego hoc corpus meum sum pro vobis traditurus'."

be hidden in the word *hoc*,[144] but in the word *est*, which should be interpreted as *significat*. To demonstrate this, Zwingli adduced several of the scriptural texts Hoen had mentioned earlier (sc. Gen 41,26; Io 15,1), adding one of his own (Lk 8,11: *semen est verbum Dei*).[145]

It was not until his response of 1 March 1526 to the letters of Theobald Billicanus and Urbanus Rhegius that Zwingli mentioned Hoen's name, placing him in the honourable company of Tertullian and Oecolampadius.[146] More than a year later, in a letter to Valentin Krautwald, Kaspar Schwenckfeld and the Silesian brethren—who at the time were approaching Zwingli's position—Zwingli explained to them "and other not less sensitive persons" the interpretation of 'est' as 'significat' which had offended them. Zwingli wrote that this expression (*sermo*) was quite usual (*triuialis*) and had been derived from popular speech (*de vulgo sumptus*) by Cornelius Hoen (*vir vt mediocriter doctus, ita inmodice pius*); it had then been taken up by Zwingli and his associates, as it was clearer and less ambiguous than the interpretation of 'est' as either 'representat', 'figura est' or as 'symbolum est'.[147] It was not until February 1527, in his *Amica exegesis ad Martinum Lutherum*, that Zwingli mentioned the names of Rode and Saganus,[148] and he mentioned their visit again in his *Dass diese Worte: 'Das ist mein Leib' ewiglich den alten Sinn haben werden* (June 1527).[149]

---

[144] On the interpretation of the pronoun in the sentence *hoc est corpus meum*, see the discussion by Southern, 'Lanfranc of Bec and Berengar of Tours', pp. 44–46.

[145] Z III, pp. 344.9–345.21.

[146] Z IV, pp. (880)893–941 (*Ad Theobaldi Billicani et Urbani Rhegii epistolas reponsio*), at p. 918.9–11 ("[…] nec inter Tertullianum ac Oecolampadium et Honium Batavum ac Zuinglium quicquam esse dissidii […]") and p. 928.17–20 ("Neque ista dicimus vt nostra hoc fulcimentum requirant, cum et Tertullianus et Oecolampadius, Honius et Zuinglius prorsus idem sentiant quod Christus, apostoli, veteres vnumque et idem genus tropi sit siue in verbo siue in praedicato explices").

[147] Z VIII, pp. 567–570, at pp. 568.17–569.22 (p. 568.21–22: "[sermo] triuialis est ac de vulgo sumptus, sed ideo assumptus est tam ab Honnio quam a nobis"). On the term "de vulgo sumptus" and its interpretation, cf. a statement by Erasmus in some editions of his *Adagia*: "Mihi videtur [sc. adagium 2377—BJS] a vulgo sumptum, non ab authoribus" (ASD II,5, p. 281, *apparatus criticus* to line 914).

[148] Z V, pp. (548)562–758, at pp. 738.4–739.2: "Ipse ex Honio Batavo (cuius epistolam Ioannes Rhodius et Georgius Saganus, viri tum pietate, tum eruditione insignes, attulerunt) per 'est pro significat' expedivi, illa certe tempestate troporum non ignarus."

[149] Z V, pp. (795)805–977, at pp. 907.9–908.4: "Und nach dem allem hatt uns gott die epistel Honii zugesendt, von dero du wol weist, die uns nit in verstand der sach gebracht hat, als die lieben brueder, die sy uns brachtend, wol wüssend—dann sy besundre fröid hattend, do sy unseren sinn in den hendlen vernamend—sunder hatt uns yngang gegeben, den einvaltigen die wort kommlich zerecht legen."

In addition to borrowing Hoen's interpretation of *est* as *significat*, Zwingli also used the words of Mt 24,23 to refute a realist interpretation of the Eucharist. In his eleven-point reply to Johannes Eck's Baden *Theses* (May 1526), Zwingli argued against Eck's first thesis, which stated that the true body and blood of Christ were present in the sacrament of the altar, saying that Christ had left the world according to his human nature and would not return bodily until the Last Day; Mt 24,23 was cited as a proof text.[150] Zwingli repeated the argument in one of his sermons (the sermon on the Apostle's Creed) at the Berne Disputation (19 January 1528).[151] Discussing the article of Christ's ascension and the location of his body at the Father's right hand, Zwingli cited this text to prove that Christ was nowhere locally present on earth. But Zwingli could, like Bucer, have derived the argument from Karlstadt, or from Oecolampadius's *De genuina interpretatione liber*, so that Hoen's influence may be indirect here. Zwingli's critique of the alleged miraculous character of transubstantiation is reminiscent of Hoen's notions as well, but may have Bucer's discussion of it as its source.[152]

Though Zwingli's dependence on Hoen's interpretation is evident, Zwingli's view and Hoen's are not identical. While Hoen defined the sacrament of the Eucharist as a pledge given by Christ, Zwingli regarded such a view as idolatry, for in his view Christ was the pledge of salvation.[153] Neither did the sacrament, in Zwingli's view, confirm, strengthen or increase faith, which view is implied in Hoen's use of the image of the ring. Zwingli also knew the metaphor of the ring and he, too, used it in connection with the Eucharist, but very differently from Hoen.[154] In *Eyn klare vnderrichtung vom Nachtmal Christi* (February 1526),

---

[150] Z V, pp. 171–195, at pp. 182.1–183.10. On Zwingli's reply, see Irena Backus, *The Disputations of Baden, 1526, and Berne, 1528: Neutralizing the Early Church*. Studies in Reformed Theology and History, I–1 (Princeton, 1993), pp. 63–69.

[151] Z VI/1, pp. (443)450–498, the first sermon on pp. 450–492; the reference to Mt 24,23 on p. 476.23–477.2. The sermons preached at the Disputation are discussed by Backus, *The Disputations of Baden, 1526, and Berne, 1528*, pp. 99–109.

[152] See *infra*, notes 184–186.

[153] Z VIII, pp. 407–413 (letter of Zwingli to Oecolampadius of 28 October 1525) at p. 410.6–7: "Commemorationem adpellauit Christus, non pignus; ipse pignus est […]."

[154] *Contra* Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther* I, p. 309, who argued that Zwingli elaborated the image of the ring "in Anlehnung an den Brief des Cornelius Hoen"; Fritz Büsser in Z VI/3, pp. 278–279 (note 7) also writes that Zwingli's use of the image of the ring "aus der *Epistola Christiana* … des Kornelis Hendriks Hoen [stammt]", though adding that "ein doppelter Unterschied" between Hoen's and Zwingli's use can be discerned.

explaining the Eucharist to be simply "ein Wieddergedechtnus und ein Bedütnus dess das einist beschehen ist", he adduced the image of the ring:

> Es ist ouch by den alten Lereren glych wie by uns das gebrucht, dass sy diss Brot und Wyn den Lychnam und Blut Christi genennet habend, wiewol sy die nun für ein Bedütung und Vermanung des Lychnams und Bluts Christi verstanden habend, glych als das fromm Wyb den Ring, den ir der hingezogen oder gestorben Gmahel zu Gedechtnus sin gelassen hat, oft iren Man nennet: "Das ist min Man sälig", der doch nun ein Manung des Manns ist.[155]

In his exposition of the high things signified by the sacramental signs in his *Expositio fidei* to the French king François I (1530/1; published by Heinrich Bullinger in 1536), Zwingli compared the bread and wine of the Eucharist with the golden ring of the king's wife. Its value was not so much determined by the gold it was made of, but rather by its being a sure token from the king her husband, who showed her his faith by giving her his ring. Thus, bread and wine were signs of the love which reconciled men with God through his Son.[156]

In a letter to Martin Bucer of 31 August 1531, Zwingli called the symbol of the ring *symbolum omnium symbolorum* and referred to a passage on this symbol in his *De conuitiis Eckii epistola* of 27 August 1530.[157] There he had written

> When a family man departing to a foreign country hands his precious ring, on which his image has been engraved, to his wife, saying: "There you have me, your husband; hold it during my absence and rejoice in him" […] then he gives much more in that way than if he were only to say: "there you have my ring" […] It is as if he said: "Be sure that I am entirely yours".[158]

Zwingli's early use of the image may be interpreted as reflecting his interpretation of the Eucharist as a doctrine of the *absentia realis*, the Lord's Supper being only a commemoration of Christ's sufferings and

---

[155] Z IV, pp. 773–862, at p. 856.12–19; p. 858.1–4. Leo Jud in his treatise *Des Hochgelehrten Erasmi von Rotterdam und Doctor Luthers maynung vom Nachtmal* used the image to the same effect: see Z IV, p. 856, note 11.

[156] See Susi Hausammann, 'Die Textgrundlage von Zwingli's *Fidei expositio*', *Zwingliana* 13 (1972) 463–472, at p. 471.

[157] The letter is not found in Zwingli's *sämtliche Werke*, but was published by J. Rott, 'Martin Bucer und die Schweiz: Drei unbekannte Briefe von Zwingli, Bucer und Vadian (1530, 1531, 1536)', in Jean Rott, *Investigationes Historicae: Églises et sociétés au XVIe siècle. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 2 vols. (Strasbourg, 1986), II, pp. 203–234, at p. 216.

[158] Z VI/iii, pp. 231–291, at pp. 278.19–282.7.

death, a confession of faith and an exercise in fraternal love. His later use of the image, however, is stronger, as leaving behind a ring with the image of the person signifies "vollgültige Stellvertretung" and therefore "Verbundenheit und Wertschätzung".[159] Still, these indications mark the discontinuity between Hoen's ideas and Zwingli's, though the impact of Hoen's treatise on Zwingli was considerable as it helped him to clarify his own still-vague ideas of a spiritualist interpretation of the sacrament.

Rode is next recorded as staying in Cologne. In a letter of 23 November 1524 Bucer and his colleagues told Luther about Erasmus's recently published *De libero arbitrio diatribe* (September 1524), the worrying and unscriptural purport of which had caused much unrest in the Low Countries as well as in Cologne. Rode had told them terrible things (*horrenda*) about that.[160] Rode's contacts with certain circles in Cologne is also documented by a letter of Kaspar Hedio (Mainz) to Wolfgang Capito, dated 21 May 1523, which ends with the statement that *Rhodius noster* would tell Capito about the situation in Cologne and elsewhere.[161] Exactly which circles Rode was acquainted with can no longer be determined. Cologne was "the only large imperial city and the only free episcopal city that was incontestably Catholic despite recurring Protestant stirrings among the people".[162] Nevertheless, dissident circles led an active, though concealed, life. An extended circle of humanists existed in Cologne as well; Andreas Canter and the Rinck and Von Reidt families were among its members. Some ten years earlier Listrius had lived

[159] See Büsser's note: Z VI/iii, p. 279.

[160] BCor I, ep. 83.221–239.

[161] See Karl and Wilhelm Krafft, edd., *Briefe und Documente aus der Zeit der Reformation im 16. Jahrhundert, nebst Mittheilungen über Kölnische Gelehrte und Studien im 13. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Elberfeld, 1875), pp. 52–53, at p. 53: "Reliqua quae Coloniae et alibi Rhodius noster referet." As we have seen, the Delft–The Hague circle in 1522 had contacts with Hedio: Canirivus wrote his well-known letter to him.

[162] Bernd Moeller, *Reichsstadt und Reformation* (Gütersloh, 1962; repr. Berlin, 1987), pp. 20–21, cited after Bernd Moeller, *Imperial Cities and the Reformation: Three Essays* (Durham, NC, 1982), p. 57. The reasons why Cologne never deviated from the path of Catholic orthodoxy are treated in R.W. Scribner, 'Why was there no Reformation in Cologne?', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 49 (1976) 217–241. See also Clemens von Looz-Corswarem, 'Die Kölner Artikelserie von 1525: Hintergründe und Verlauf des Aufruhrs von 1525 in Köln', in F. Petri, ed., *Kirche und gesellschaftlicher Wandel in deutschen und niederländischen Städten der werdenden Neuzeit* (Cologne–Vienna, 1980), pp. 65–101, who denies the influence of Luther's ideas behind the revolt of June 1525.

there and had taught Greek.[163] In the *Epistles of Obscure Men* the conservative Cologne university was mercilessly attacked. But the movement was too weak to take advantage of the patronage it enjoyed.[164] Did Erasmus's tract cause unrest among these humanists? Or was Hedio referring to the conflict in the Cologne house of the Augustinian Hermits? There was an evangelical movement within this house and it had close contact with Wittenberg. The university and the archbishop, and ultimately the regent, Margaret of Austria, forced the city council to investigate the house.[165] These investigations started in June 1523, and Hedio may have been referring to the threat of this imminent trial. Or was he thinking of the consternation caused by Gerard Westerburg (Andreas Karlstadt's brother-in-law)? His treatise on purgatory, its dissemination in Cologne and his subsequent readiness for a public disputation, were strongly opposed by the city council in the spring of 1523.[166] There are no sources which provide an exact answer to these questions.

In November 1524 Rode stayed with Martin Bucer in Strasbourg. In his letter to Martinus Germanus, preacher in Fürfeld (near Heilbronn), written in the autumn of 1525, Bucer reported his discussions with Rode in some detail.[167] In this letter Bucer actually gave an explanation of the

---

[163] Spruyt, ed., 'Gerardus Listrius' *Epistola theologica aduersus Dominicanos Suollenses*', p. 225, note 8.

[164] Scribner, 'Why was there no Reformation in Cologne?', pp. 229–231, 233–234.

[165] See Scribner, 'Why was there no Reformation in Cologne?', pp. 231–232; Von Looz-Corswarem, 'Die Kölner Artikelserie von 1525', p. 69.

[166] See Georg Eduard Steitz, 'Dr. Gerhard Westerburg, der Leiter des Bürgeraufstandes zu Frankfurt a.M. im Jahre 1525', *Archiv für Frankfurts Geschichte und Kunst* n.s., 5 (1872) 1–215, at pp. 13–22. In 1542 Westerburg was appointed a councillor to Duke Albrecht of Prussia and got to know Gnapheus; see Gnapheus's letter to A Lasco in S.A. Gabbema, ed., *Epistolarum ab illustribus et claris viris scriptarum centuriae tres* (Harlingen, 1663), pp. 25–29.

[167] BCor II, ep. 109 (pp. 50–54). On the addressee of this letter, see Jean Rott's review of J.V. Pollet, *Martin Bucer. Études sur la correspondance, avec de nombreux textes inédits*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1958–1962)—who had (vol. I, pp. 12–18) also edited the letter and had identified Martin Frecht as its recipient—in *Investigationes Historicae* II, pp. 158–164 ('Correspondance de Bucer'), at p. 160; and BCor II, p. 50, note 1, p. 52, note 7, and p. 54. On its date of composition, see BCor II, p. 54. The letter was partly translated into German and discussed in W.F. Dankbaar, *Martin Bucers Beziehungen zu den Niederlanden*, pp. 8–14. See also J.W. Baum, *Capito und Butzer* (Elberfeld, 1860; repr. Nieuwkoop, 1967), pp. 300–305; August Lang, *Der Evangelienkomentar Martin Bucers* (Leipzig, 1900; repr. Aalen, 1972), pp. 212–214; Hastings Eells, 'The Genesis of Martin Bucer's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper', *Princeton Theological Review* 24 (1926) 225–251, and Ian Hazlett, *The Develoment of Martin Bucer's Thinking on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Its Historical and Theological Context* (Münster, 1975), pp. 91ff.

development of his views on the Lord's Supper, in which Rode, and Hoen's letter, had played a significant role.

Initially, Bucer writes, he had followed Luther in his interpretation of the words *hoc est corpus meum*, while stressing at the same time the importance of a spiritual partaking in commemoration of Christ's sacrifice. But when Karlstadt's treatises began to appear in the autumn of 1524, he began to doubt his position, though he saw that Karlstadt's interpretation and the New Testament passages on the Eucharist were at odds. In any case, he refuted the doctrine of impanation[168] and conceded a symbolic interpretation; the eucharistic bread was merely a symbol, and as such worthless, "nisi fide rapiaris in Christum pro te mortuum, carne ad dexteram Patris, Spiritu tecum habitante et implente omnia vsque ad consummationem saeculi".[169] Bucer (and his Strasbourg colleagues) communicated this opinion to Zwingli,[170] to the preachers of Basel and Zurich[171] and to Luther,[172] asking at the same time their opinion on Karlstadt's recent offensive publications. In reply Zwingli sent them a copy of his manuscript letter to Matthäus Alber,[173] while Luther—contrary to his earlier views, those from Strasbourg thought—did not accept their interpretation, but wrote in a friendly manner.[174]

It was exactly at this time that Rode visited Bucer. In his letter to Luther of 23 November 1524, Bucer mentions Rode's stay, writing that two days earlier Rode had told them about the unrest and uncertainty Erasmus's *De libero arbitrio diatribe* (September 1524) had caused in the Netherlands and in Cologne. In the meantime, Rode had departed for Basel. Bucer's letter clearly reveals that he was impressed with Rode:

> Interea venit vir pius quidam ad me: Ioanni Rhodio nomen est, tam absolute Christiano pectore et lingua praeditus, vt equidem nulli illum secundum possum facere, quod ad iuditium fidei et vitam fide dignam pertinet,—ne Lutherum quidem excipio, quanquam docendi spiritu Lutherus multo sit ditior.—Patria illi Rhodio inferior Germania est, in qua id agit quod Paulus agebat apud Graecos. Is etsi Lutherum quoque

---

168 BCor II, ep. 109.43–46: "Incarnatus est Christus. Id viderunt et attestarunt Apostoli […] Vobis etiam impanatur. Quis prophetarum aut Apostolorum hoc vnquam praedicauit?"

169 BCor II, ep. 109.38–40.

170 BCor I, ep. 80 (pp. 278–281); Zwingli's reply: BCor I, ep. 84 (pp. 298–315).

171 BCor I, ep. 81 (pp. 281–287).

172 BCor I, ep. 83 (pp. 288–297).

173 BCor I, ep. 84.490–513.

174 Luther's *Eyn brieff an die Christen zu Straspurg widder den schwermer geyst*: WA XV, pp. (380)391–397.

> magistrum agnoscat in quibusdam, Weselo tamen suo plus debet, quem virum miror nobis tam parui esse. Hic itaque hospes tum meus de hac re solidis scripturis mecum multa egit, contra quem omnibus viribus tuebar sententiam Lutheri; sed agnoui profecto [me esse] spiritui viri multo inferiorem, neque posse per scripturas tueri quod cupiebam, coactusque fui carnalem Christi in pane praesentiam cedere, licet de certa verborum enarratione adhuc hesitarem.[175]

Rode, as a learned, but more especially as a pious man who regarded Luther and particularly Wessel as his masters, succeeded in persuading Bucer (who did his utmost to defend Luther's position) of the correctness of the symbolic interpretation of the Eucharist. Still, Bucer was not yet sure of the correct interpretation of the word *est* in the words of consecration. Luther's opposition to the significative 'Waldensian' interpretation in his *Von Anbeten des Sakraments des heiligen Leichnams Christi* (April 1523) had so much impressed Bucer that he did not yet dare to support that interpretation. Then he received Zwingli's letter. Zwingli argued in favour of the significative and wrote that several church fathers as well as Wyclif had supported this explanation. Bucer then examined Luther's arguments against this interpretation anew, and concluded that they were unfounded; the interpretation *hoc significat corpus meum* did not necessarily imply that the words "Christ is the Son of God" should be interpreted likewise. All this had taken place by December 1524. In his *Grund und Ursach der neüwerungen an dem nachtmal des herren* (January 1525),[176] Bucer refuted Karlstadt's interpretation that Christ had pointed to his own body when he pronounced the words *hoc est corpus meum*,[177] and propounded at length a significative, commemorative interpretation of the Eucharist, including arguments used earlier by Hoen.[178]

After Rode's visit Wessel figures in Bucer's correspondence as the most important witness for a spiritual interpretation of the Eucharist. In his letter to Hans III Landschad von Steinach—who in 1524 had engaged Otter as a preacher—Bucer summarized his position in seven points, listing under the fifth point the names of theologians whose scriptural interpretation was similar to his. He mentions Wessel in addition to Wyclif, Zwingli and Oecolampadius, and includes "the evan-

---

[175] BCor II, ep. 109.72–83.

[176] MBDS I, pp. (185)194–278.

[177] MBDS I, p. 250.18–27: "Als […] habe [der herr] mit dem woertlin (das) auff sein natürlichen leyb gedeütet." Cf. BCor, ep. 81.38–44.

[178] See MBDS I, pp. 247.38–254.20.

gelicals" in France, Italy, England, Bohemia and the Netherlands. In the latter case he was undoubtedly thinking of Rode and Hoen.[179] A similar enumeration occurs in Bucer's letter of 1 December 1525 to the lords of Gemmingen, one of whom (Philip) had engaged Martinus Germanus in 1521. Although the simple folk looked for the bodily Christ in the eucharistic bread, Tertullian and Berengar, Wyclif, Hus and the Waldensians, as well as Wessel and, in modern times, Zwingli and Oecolampadius, had taught that the bread was a sign of Christ's body, which should be taken with faith.[180] He evidently also mentioned Wessel in his letter (now lost)[181] to Martin Schalling, preacher in Weingarten, who held to consubstantiation and in his reply to Bucer wrote that Luther's views and arguments, as far as he was concerned, were more decisive than Wessel's.[182]

Moreover, although Hoen is not mentioned in the letter to Martinus Germanus, Bucer evidently propagated Hoen's views. In order to avoid an apparently imminent breach between Wittenberg on the one hand and Zurich and Strasbourg on the other, Bucer wrote the letters referred to and, with his Strasbourg colleagues, in the autumn of 1525 sent Georgius Casselius (reader of Hebrew at Strasbourg) as a mediator to Wittenberg. To supply them with convincing arguments, he sent a Latin copy of Hoen's treatise to Jacob Otter, and a copy of its German translation to Johannes Landschad von Steinach. In his letter to Landschad, Bucer propounded now familiar arguments such as the appeal to Mt 24,23 and to the nature of truly biblical miracles.[183] Although Bucer, as we have seen, cannot possibly have been the editor of Hoen's *Epistola*, he may (in view of his active interest in and propagation of it) have had a hand in its Strasbourg translation, but there is no conclusive evidence for this suggestion.

---

[179] MBDS III, pp. 431–441; BCor II, ep. 107 (22 October 1525).

[180] BCor, ep. 114.47–59.

[181] Kaufmann, *Die Abendmahlstheologie der Strassburger Reformatoren bis 1528*, pp. 305–306, note 214, guesses that this letter has been preserved and is identical with Bucer's ep. 109.

[182] BCor II, ep. 139.69–73.

[183] See MBDS III, pp. 421–430 (*Instructio ad Wittembergenses*); MBDS III, p. 418 and MBDS III, pp. 431–441 (to Johann Ritter Landschad von Steinach). And see Jean Rott, 'Bucer et les ébuts de la querelle sacramentaire: L'instruction donnée à Gregoire Casselius pour sa mission auprès de Luther (octobre 1525)', in Rott, *Investigationes Historicae* II, pp. 182–202, at pp. 184–185, notes 12 and 13; Kaufmann, *Die Abendmahlstheologie der Strassburger Reformatoren bis 1528*, pp. 294, 303–306.

Thanks, then, to Rode's stay in Strasbourg, Hoen's ideas were made known and accepted there. As a result of his discussion with Rode, Bucer accepted the commemorative interpretation of the Eucharist, and inclined towards accepting the significative interpretation of the words of institution. In this period Bucer also alluded to Mt 24,23, but he believed that he derived it from Karlstadt's treatises.[184] Traces of Hoen's *Epistola* in Bucer's utterances can be detected in a passage in his letter to Martinus Germanus in which he wrote that in Scripture no miracles are mentioned which are to be believed while remaining invisible. Hoen had made the same point in his critique of transubstantiation: bread was said to be miraculously changed into Christ's body, while the senses testified that bread plainly remained bread.[185] The following passage (already referred to) in which Bucer contrasted Christ's incarnation and his alleged impanation is also reminiscent of Hoen's treatise.[186]

What is evident from the above is that Hoen's treatise, thanks to Rode's travels and his propagation of it, played a significant role in the first debates on the Eucharist between Wittenberg and Zurich. It supplied Karlstadt with arguments which led to his breach with Luther and his expulsion from Saxony; the treatises Karlstadt wrote next (in the autumn of 1524) provoked Luther's anger, but eventually partly convinced the Zurich and Strasbourg reformers of the correctness of some of his arguments. Together, Karlstadt's treatises and Hoen's letter helped them to clarify their more symbolic, commemorative and significative interpretation of the Eucharist, which proved of lasting significance for the reformed tradition.

---

[184] BCor I, ep. 81.52–78: "'Cum dicent: Christus hic, Christus illic, non est credendum'; ergo eucharistia panis Christi est, non Christus […] Hae fere sunt Carolstadij rationes […]"; ep. 83.45–55; MBDS III, pp. 436.24–437.1: "Item, so kumen wurden, die do sagten, das Christus hie oder dortt sy, sollen wir in nit glauben, vnd besunder an disem ort sagt er, man sölle sein gedächtnuss halten".

[185] BCor II, ep. 109.41–43; MBDS III, p. 440.14–16 (October 1525). Bucer repeated the argument in a letter of July 1526 to the "Italian brethren" (actually the preface to the fourth volume of Bucer's Latin translation of Luther's Postille): BCor II, ep. 135.439–460. For Zwingli, see Z IV, pp. 894.24–898.5 and 908.16–909.17; Z V, pp. 594.6–8, where Zwingli writes about "Buceri argumentum quo nimirum dixit Christum nuspiam fecisse miraculum quod nemo sentiret". For Luther's critique of the argument, see his letter to Johann Herwagen of September 1526: WA XIX, pp. (462)471–473, at p. 472.13–23.

[186] BCor II, ep. 109.43–46.

In the Netherlands Hoen's treatise probably remained unknown during the first decades of the sixteenth century.[187] Evidently, he discussed his views with the other members of the Delft–The Hague circle and with Hinne Rode, and showed them the written results of his readings and reflections. Hoen's treatise is mentioned on the 1557 *Index auctorum et librorum* …, which was composed by order of Pope Paul IV and printed in 1559. The work is mentioned under the title of *Epistola Christiana de coena Domini*.[188] In addition, the influence of Hoen's ideas is discernible in the thought of the notorious Anabaptist Melchior Hoffman. In his *Die Ordonnantie Godts* of 1530, Hoffman expounded that the bridegroom Christ comes to his bride, takes the bread—just as a bridegroom takes a ring or a piece of gold—and thus gives himself with the bread to his bride, just as a bridegroom gives himself to his bride with a ring.[189] Hoffman also appealed to Mt 24,23 to substantiate his refutation of a Lutheran interpretation of the sacrament. In the *Breef an die Glövigen der Stadt Kyle wedder eeren Prediger Melchior Hoffman* (1528) the Lutheran preacher Marquard Schuldorp described as Hoffman's view the opinion that faith in Christ's real presence on the altar was a seduction of the papists, who during the last days would cry, "Lo, here is Christ". Another opponent of Hoffman's, Eberhard Weidensee, in his *Eyn vnderricht vth der hillighen schryfft, dem dorchlüchtygen hochgebarnen Forsten vnd Herrn Christiarnn* (1529), likewise wrote that Hoffman had used the image of the ring to explain his interpretation of the Lord's Supper and that he had also written that false prophets cried, "Lo, here is Christ".[190]

But Hoen's work is not mentioned in any heresy trial. It may have been known in Louvain, where an extensive circle of "sacramentarians" under the leadership of Paul de Roovere (priest and chaplain of St

---

[187] Cf. Trapman, 'Le role des "sacramentaires"', p. 20. Trapman argues that it was through Zwingli's writings that "le message du juriste hollandais a pu parvenir plus tard aux habitants des Pays-Bas". Zwingli's direct relationship with the Netherlands, however, can only be documented by his letter of 1529 to Johannes Cousardus of Ghent. The Brussel dissidents who were tried in 1527 explicitly referred to a treatise by Oecolampadius, from which they had derived their dissenting view on the Eucharist. Oecolampadius was regarded by Catholic opponents as the *instaurator* of the view that *in Eucharistia non est Christus nisi in signo*. See Johan Decavele, 'Vroege reformatorische bedrijvigheid in de grote Nederlandse steden: Claes van der Elst te Brussel, Antwerpen, Amsterdam en Leiden (1524–1528)', NAK 70 (1990) 13–29, at pp. 22–23, note 28.

[188] See Franz Heinrich Reusch, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher: ein Beitrag zur Kirchen- und Literaturgeschichte* I (Bonn, 1883; repr. Aalen, 1967), p. 285.

[189] BRN V, pp. 125–170, at p. 156.

[190] See Calvin Augustine Pater, *Karlstadt as the Father of the Baptist Movements: The Emergence of Lay Protestantism* (Toronto, 1984), pp. 227–231.

Peter's church)[191] was prosecuted by the Inquisition in the 1540s.[192] During his interrogation on 28 May 1543, Jean Beyaerts, who was charged (and later beheaded), avowed that he had heard De Roovere say during Lent of the preceding year

> that the Holy Sacrament was only a sign and that Christ left it behind for us as a wedding ring so that we would remember his sufferings as a firmly established testament, just as a man marries his wife.[193]

The symbol of the ring was used to the same effect in a vernacular treatise on the Lord's Supper, which, in addition, also appealed to Mt 24,23 to refute the doctrine of the *praesentia realis*.[194] Formerly it was thought that this treatise was produced within the Louvain circle some time around 1540, and that traces of Hoen's influence were discernable here as well.[195] Recently, however, it has been established that it was printed in the 1550s, probably in Kampen.[196] By this date, these and similar arguments may have been so widely diffused that Hoen's influence need not have been direct or conscious.

---

[191] See R. van Santbergen, *Un procès de religion a Louvain: Paul de Roovere 1542–1546* (Brussels, 1953).

[192] On this circle, see W. Bax, *Het protestantisme in het bisdom Luik en vooral te Maastricht*, 2 vols. (The Hague, 1937–1941), I, pp. 170–216; R. van Uytven, 'Bijdrage tot de sociale geschiedenis van de protestanten te Leuven in de eerste helft der XVIe eeuw', *Mededelingen van de Geschied- en Oudheidkundige Kring voor Leuven en omgeving* (1963), pp. 3–38. A view from within is provided in Francisco de Enzinas, *Historia de statu Belgico deque religione Hispanica*, F. Socas, ed. (Stuttgart–Leipzig, 1991). Before this C.C. de Bruin, 'Beschouwingen rondom het Leuvense ketterproces van 1543', *Rondom het Woord* 9 (1967) 249–259, at p. 256, had already noticed Hoen's influence within the circle of the Louvain dissidents.

[193] See Ch.-Al. Campan, ed., *Mémoires de Francisco de Enzinas. Texte latin inédit avec la traduction française en regard, 1543–1545*, 2 vols. (Brussels–The Hague, 1862), I, p. 430. Valérand Poullain (1520–1557) of Lille, who stayed at Louvain for some time, used the image of the ring in his *Traicte tres vtile du S. Sacrement de la Cene* (1547); see Dankbaar, *Martin Bucers Beziehungen zu den Niederlanden*, p. 28. Poullain was soon to learn the obligatory nature of presenting a ring. Although already engaged to a girl named Merne, he presented a ring to Isabelle de Haméricourt, Dame de Willercies, and pledged her his troth; Poullain was consequently accused of polygamy and called *une beste venimeuse* by John Calvin. See A.A. van Schelven, 'Zur Biographie und Theologie des Valérand Poullain', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 47 (1928) 227–249, at pp. 246–249; *Die Amerbachkorrespondenz* VI, Beat Rudolf Jenny, ed. (Basel, 1967), ep. 2948 (pp. 468–470).

[194] NK 2323; J. Trapman, ed., *Dat Avontmael ons Heeren*, NAK 51 (1970–1971) 149–166, at pp. 157–158, 162.

[195] NK 2323; Spruyt, 'Wessel Gansfort and Cornelis Hoen's *Epistola Christiana*', p. 140.

[196] See Paul Valkema Blouw, 'The Van Oldenborch and Vanden Merberghe pseudonyms *or* Why Frans Fraet had to die', *Quaerendo* 22 (1992) 165–190, 245–272, at p. 268.

Only in the second half of the century did Hardenberg, somewhat distortedly, record reports about Hoen, his friends, their discovery of a *vetus scriptum* and Rode's travels. In the next century—with the emergence of the conflicts between Remonstrants and Contra-Remonstrants—and later, these reports would start to function in confessional debates and would determine Hoen's *fortuna critica* until the age of modern, detached historical research.[197]

[197] See chapter I.

EPILOGUE

Although in the past many scholars have occupied themselves with Hoen and the significance of his treatise, it now seems possible to draw more firmly the contours of his portrait and to specify the sources as well as the influence of his ideas.

As a figure, he gains in importance when placed in the context of his times and the cultural changes which were then taking place. Hoen's career and the contents of his treatise reflect the waning of the religious ideals of the late Middle Ages as well as the breakthrough of a new mentality. From his biography Hoen appears as a self-conscious patrician of the county of Holland, well informed on the currents of his time. As a jurist he was (like all other members of the Court of Holland) an adherent of the *mos italicus*; on the other hand, he was acquainted with Erasmus's works and as a humanist Christian he incorporated one of the latter's philological annotations in his epistle. Hoen's treatise attacks the dogma of transubstantiation, but at the same time it turns against other ecclesiastical institutions such as indulgences and purgatory. Here, Hoen voiced a mood widespread in the Netherlands in the early 1520s. Recent research has revealed that around 1520 ecclesiastical revenues unexpectedly and dramatically decreased. Hoen recorded this development and welcomed it: in his view, Christ was to be served spiritually and one's neighbour (and not the church) materially. Hoen's early trial made him one of the first victims of the repression of the early Reformation in the Low Countries. Moreover, his case forced the Court of Holland, under pressure from the States, to change its policy and adhere to its privilege *de non euocando* against those who were of the opinion that a case like Hoen's fell under the jurisdiction of the imperial commission created to prosecute heresy. The States then induced the regent to remove Hulst; Charles V would not again attempt to create such a specific tribunal.

In Hoen's ideas the three currents of the early Reformation converge: biblical humanism, the influence of Martin Luther and the survival of late medieval dissent. Both Erasmus and Luther influenced Hoen. His debt to Luther is also apparent from the fact that it was

probably Rode who first presented Hoen's insights to the Wittenberg reformer. But his most characteristic ideas Hoen derived from medieval heretical traditions. Many of his arguments had already been formulated by Berengar, the Cathars, and later by Wyclif, Hus and their radical followers; they had been mentioned in scholastic treatises in order that they might be refuted. At least as interesting as the presence of particular arguments of Wyclif and Hus in Hoen's treatise is the different context in which they functioned. While Wyclif and Hus never denied Christ's real presence in the sacrament and turned their arguments against what they saw as certain abuses, Hoen used their arguments against the belief that Christ was present in the eucharistic bread. In Hoen's view Christ's warning not to believe those who would say, "Christ is here or there" (Mt 24, 23) flatly contradicted this. The different use of the same or similar arguments also reflects an important transformation in the religious life of the late Middle Ages. After their death, the ideas of Wyclif and Hus spread widely and in this process were popularized and radicalized. This spread is closely connected to the increase in literacy during this period: laymen now had access to written texts (or were instructed by literate leaders).

It has been pointed out correctly that Hoen's views and contemporary popular ideas about the Mass correspond closely. Zwingli's remark that Hoen derived his interpretation of *hoc est corpus meum* as *hoc significat corpus meum* from popular speech (*sermo de vulgo sumptus*) is illuminating. Alastair Duke shrewdly remarked that "Hoen cannot be the source for the sacramentarism detected in the Low Countries […]. Nor indeed is it easy to reconcile the crude repudiation of the real presence by these dissidents with Hoen's dignified statement of the eucharist".[1] The facts discussed here rather invite us to assume that "the crude repudiation of the real presence" by contemporary lay people was one of Hoen's sources and that he tried to lift their arguments to a higher level in order to give them a voice in the debate about the most important sacrament of the church.

Hoen's treatise was influential in Germany and Switzerland when the dawn of the Reformation was breaking. Between 1525–1526 two Latin and three German editions of his writing appeared. Although the arguments it contained were highly traditional, the text caused much unrest to reformers like Zwingli and Bucer, who seem to have

[1] Duke, p. 21.

been confronted by these ideas for the first time. Hoen's epistle led them to develop a symbolic view of the Lord's Supper which differed from Luther's interpretation. In view of the repetition of some of the arguments used by Hoen (the appeal to Mt 24,23 and the use of the metaphor of the ring) in Melchior Hoffman's thought, his epistle not only establishes the continuity between late medieval dissent and the early Reformation, but also between the early and the radical Reformation.

APPENDICES

THE LATIN TEXT OF THE *EPISTOLA CHRISTIANA*

Conspectus siglorum

A: ed. [Worms: Peter Schöffer the Younger,] 1525.
B1: ed. [Strasbourg: Johann Knobloch, 1525].
B2: ed. [Strasbourg: Johann Knobloch, 1525].
C: ed. Daniel Gerdes in his *Introductio in historiam Euangelii passim per Europam renouati doctrinaeque reformatae* I (Groningen, 1744), appendix: *Monumenta antiquitatis ad illustrandam historiam Reformationis ecclesiasticam facientia*, pp. 228–240.
D: ed. Ernst Ludwig Enders in *Dr. Martin Luthers Briefwechsel* III (Calw–Stuttgart, 1889), pp. 412–425 (no. 552).
E: ed. Georg Finsler in Z IV, pp. 512–519.

Note: Though Gerdes based his edition on an apograph, which as such is a negligible witness, his edition has played such an important role in Hoen's critical fortune that Gerdes's variants have been included in this new edition.

B1 underlay Enders's edition. He regarded it as the first edition and ascribed it to Christoph Froschauer. He compared it with C and tacitly corrected some of its printing errors.

Finsler, as has been demonstrated in the fourth chapter, based his edition on B, which he attributed to Froschauer, and took it for granted that A was based on B.

A. Eekhof edited a facsimile edition of A. For the contemporary German translations of the text, see the second appendix. For all later translations, see chapter IV, note 78.

As Hoen's autograph is missing, his orthography is unknown; what we have is only the typography as the printers gave it. For this reason, the text has been systematically modernized (on this principle, see Allen, vol. I, p. vii and A. Dain, *Les manuscrits* [3th ed.; Paris, 1975], p. 173). Evident misprints and orthographic variants in the text have been corrected tacitly, except for some purely orthographic variants which throw light on the history of the transmission of the text.

EPISTOLA CHRISTIANA ADMODVM, AB ANNIS QVATVOR AD QVENDAM APVD QVEM OMNE IVDICIVM SACRAE SCRIPTVRAE FVIT EX BATAVIS MISSA, SED SPRETA, LONGE ALITER TRACTANS CENAM DOMINICAM QVAM HACTENVS TRACTATA EST, AD CALCEM QVIBVSDAM ADIECTIS, CHRISTIANO HOMINI PERNECESSARIIS PRAESERTIM HIS PERICVLOSIS TEMPORIBVS.

1 Corinth. 11: *Non potestis cenam Dominicam manducare quod vnusquisque propriam cenam occupat in edendo* [1Cor 11,21].

MDXXV

Dominus noster Iesus Christus multotiens suis remissionem peccatorum promittens volensque in vltima cena suorum animos confirmare, pignus promissioni addidit ne aliquo modo vacillarent, quemadmodum sponsus, qui cupit suam sponsam certam reddere ne quo modo dubitet, dat ei anulum dicens: 'Accipe, do me ipsum tibi', illa anulum accipiens, sponsum credit esse suum ac animum ab omnibus auertit amatoribus et suo vt placeat marito cogitat. Similiter sumens eucharistiam, pignus sponsi sui, qui seipsum dare testatur, firmiter credere debet Christum iam esse suum, pro se traditum atque sanguinem eius pro se fusum, quare animum ab omnibus auertet quae prius amare solet et soli Christo inhaerebit, quaerens quae placita sunt ei semper, pro se autem nihil magis sollicitus erit, sed omnem curam reiiciet in Christum, quem suum credit atque eum solum abunde satis esse sibi ad omnia. Hoc est vere Christum manducare et sanguinem eius bibere, vt ait Saluator Ioan. VI: *Qui manducat meam carnem et bibit meum sanguinem, in me manet et ego in eo* [Io 6,57].

Qui vero sine hac fide eucharistiam sumunt, manna Iudaeorum potius quam Christum videntur manducare. Huius tamen viuacissimae fidei scholastici Romani non meminerunt, sed aliam quandam mortuam diligenter docuisse, putabant esse satis, cum dicerent panem post

---

5–6 *adiectis*] *additis* C. 6 *praesertim*] *paeserrtim* B1, D. 7 *his*] *hiis* A. 8 *1*] *2* C. 9 *edendo*] *edendo. Per Honnium Batavum* C. 10 *MDXXV*] omisit B1, B2. 11 *remissionem*] *promissionem* C. 19 *eius*] omisit C. 20 For *solet* meaning *solebat*, see J. Trapman, '*Solet* instead of *solebat* in Erasmus and other Neo-Latin authors', *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 44 (1995) 197–201.

consecrationem verum Christi corpus esse. Et de modo quo hoc fiat, multa subtilia nullis Scripturis probata. Sed fides illa cum historica sit, clarum est quod iustificare non possit. An autem temere accepta, damnari non possit videamus. Cernimus enim per hanc panem consecratum adorari et modis omnibus honorari pro Deo. Qui si Deus non est, rogo quantum ab illis ethnicis, qui ligna et lapides coluerunt, distamus? Putabant enim illis numen inesse, quod non erat, nec lapides voluissent adorasse, nisi prius illos temerarii deos esse credidissent.

At dicet quis: 'Nos verbum Dei habemus, dicentis: *Hoc est corpus meum*'. Verum est, verbum Domini habetis et similiter habuistis quod pro tyrannide faceret Romana, scilicet: *Quodcunque ligaueris* etc. [Mt 16,19]. Sed illud diligentius excussum, inuentum est nihil pro tyrannide facere. Quare item praesentia discutiamus ne nobis, duces caecos sequentibus, simul cum illis in foueam contingat incidere [cf. Mt 15,14]. Vetuit enim Dominus credere illis qui dicunt: *Hic vel illic est Christus* [Mt 24,23], quare fidem habere non debeo dicentibus in pane esse Christum, alioqui non possem me excusare quasi deceptum qui praemonentem recusassem audire Christum. Sunt enim nunc tempora illa periculosa in quibus hoc fore praedixit. Neque apostoli de hoc sacramento ita locuti sunt: panem fregerunt, panem appellauerunt et de hac fide Romana tacuerunt omnes.

Nec obstat Paulus ICorinth. X, qui licet dicat: *Nonne panis quem frangimus, participatio corporis Domini est?* [ICor 10,16], non tamen dicit: 'Panis est corpus Domini', vt illo loco fere manifestum sit 'est' pro 'significat' exponi, quod euidentius patet ex comparatione quam facit [cf. ICor 10,19–20] de pane nostro ad immolata idolis. Quae fatetur in veritate non mutari, tamen ea dicit 'esse' vel 'significare' quandam communicationem cum diabolo cui sunt immolata. Qua de causa docet abstinendum ab illis, nisi sine discretione sumerentur.

Et de hac re temporibus Thomae Aquinatis fuerunt qui dicerent Christum in pane esse, sed tanquam in signo (quod alii dixerunt sacramentaliter tantum et non corporaliter). Licet hanc opinionem veluti haereticam Thomas reiiciat, cuius verbis vt oraculo haerent Romani, non possunt tamen soluere verbum Christi dicentis: *Si quis dixerit vobis quia hic est Christus, nolite credere* [Mt 24,23]. Ad quod etiam videtur facere verbum Pauli in loco praeallegato, vbi dicit eandem escam spiritualem manducasse patres in deserto nobiscum [cf. ICor 10,1–6].

---

9 *dicet*] *dicit* C. 24 *fere*] omisit C. 26 *idolis*] *ydolis* A.

Sed primum videamus quibus fundamentis suam doctrinam muniant Romani, rem adeo singularem et mirandam vt huic similis non reperiatur in Scripturis. Legimus Christum incarnatum sed semel tantum et hoc in vtero virginis, at illud ita futurum multis prophetarum oraculis fuit praedictum, per Christum vita, morte et conuersatione ostensum, ab apostolis praedicatum. Quod autem Christus quotidie impanatur (vt ita loquar) in manibus cuiusuis sacrificuli neque a prophetis est praedictum neque ab apostolis praedicatum. Illo solo fundatur quod Christus dixit: *Hoc est corpus meum, hoc facite in mei commemorationem* [cf. Lc 22,19]. Quibus verbis si Christus hoc voluisset quod dicunt, certe vnicum verbum sufficere debere non dubitamus. Sed mirum quare non similiter dicant Iohannem Baptistam transsubstantiatum in Heliam cum de eo diceret Christus: *Ipse est Helias*, Mat. XI [Mt 11,14], aut Euangelistam in Christum dicente Domino in cruce ad matrem de illo: *Ecce, filius tuus* [Io 19,26], aut Christum in petram cum se demonstrans ait: *Supra hanc Petram* [Mt 16,18], et rursum petram in Christum cum Paulus dicit: *Petra erat Christus* [ICor 10,4]. Vel, si hoc loco expositionem accipimus dicendo: Petra erat Christus, id est, repraesentabat Christum, quare in proposito idem non audemus, maxime cum ait hoc agendum in eius commemorationem et commemoratio absentis saltem corporaliter potius videatur quam praesentis. Scio consuetudinem in causa esse, quare hoc loco ab expositione abhorrent aures, quod aliis in locis non contingit, sed diuersitatis rationem inuenire non possum: multi similes loci adduci possint vbi Christus se ostium [cf. Io 10, 7,9], viam [cf. Io 14,6], lapidemue [cf. Mt 21,42] dixerit et Iohan. XV ait: *Ego sum vitis vera* [Io 15,1], tamen non ibi sumus tam rigidi vt Christum vitem naturalem veram fuisse dicamus. Quid nos solo hoc loco angustat, praeterquam pontificis auctoritas, non possum sapere.

Consideremus ergo pro maiori declaratione triplicem panem spiritualem: Christum qui fide comeditur, de quo Iohan. VI, manna, quod manducauerunt patres in deserto, et eucharistiam Christianorum, de quo in proposito. Inter hos panes quae sit differentia videamus.

Et primum de duobus primis locus est clarissimus in Iohanne praeallegatus, vbi Christus ait: *Ego sum panis vitae. Patres vestri manducauerunt manna in deserto et mortui sunt. Hic est panis de coelo descendens; si quis ex ipso*

---

13 *Euangelistam*] *Ioannem Evangelistam* E. 15 Supra] Super C. 17 *accipimus*] *admittimus* C. 19 *proposito*] *praeposito* B1, B2, C, D, E. 22 *hoc loco*] *in hoc loco* C. 24 *possint*] *possent* C. | *ostium*] *hostium* A, B1, B2. 26 *non ibi*] *ibi non* B1, B2, C, D, E. 32 *proposito*] *praeposito* C.

manducauerit, non morietur [Io 6,48–50]. Hic manifeste Christus declarat differentiam inter panem Iudaeis de caelo missum in deserto et seipsum panem, quem ipse erat daturus pro vita mundi, quia licet ille significabat Christum e caelis venturum pro vita mundi, non tamen erat Christus, qui est panis viuus et vitae. Ille autem neque viuebat, neque dabat vitam, vnde ipsum manducantes mortui sunt. Qui vero Christum manducant, non moriuntur, sed viuent in aeternum. Et sic habemus differentiam duorum priorum.

De tertio autem Paulus I. ad Corinth. X dicit eandem esse escam spiritualem Iudaeorum cum eucharistia, pane nostro [cf. I Cor 10,1–17], quem frangimus in memoriam Christi, qui descendit pro mundi vita, vt hic significet factum quod illud significabat futurum. Ergo nec eucharistia panis viuus et vitae est, quia etiam ipsum manducantes moriuntur. Sicut ergo transitus filiorum Israel per mare rubrum significabat transitum per mortem ad vitam aeternam, non tamen omnes mare transeuntes ad eam vitam peruenerunt, sed tantum illi qui per fidem commoriebantur Christo futuro, ita in nostro baptismo significatur transitus per mortem ad vitam, non tamen ad eam vitam omnes baptizati perueniunt, sed qui Christo iam mortuo commoriuntur per fidem, resurgunt cum ipso per eandem. Sic et manna in deserto significabat Christum panem vitae qui ab aeterna morte praeseruabat, sed non omnes manna manducantes ab illa morte praeseruati sunt, sed tantum illi qui Christum futurum fide manducarunt, quia manna licet significabat Christum, non tamen erat Christus. Simile est in sacramento eucharistiae, autore Paulo, quare sicut ille non erat quod significabat, quod Christus probat in Iohanne ex eo, quod ipsum manducantes a morte aeterna non seruabat, ita nec nostra eucharistia est Christus, quem significat, simili argumento, quia manducantes ab aeterna morte non seruat. Ideo nos hortatur Paulus ne simus concupiscentes malorum [cf. I Cor 10,6], palpantes nobis propter baptismum aut panis sacramentum, quasi haec habeamus prae Iudaeis, vel quasi rem nos habeamus, ipsi vero solum signa. Non sic se res habet, dicit apostolus, nam esca spiritualis vestra eadem est cum esca patrum; quare sicut illis non pepercit peccantibus, ita nec vobis faciet, si vobis defuerit fides per charitatem recte operans [Gal 5,6], qua sola tam ipsi quam nos rem accipimus istis signis signatam. Propterea scriptum est Psalmo XV: *Non dabis sanctum tuum videre*

3–4 *significabat*] *significat* C. 10 *eucharistia*] *eucharistiae* D, E. 12 *significet*] *significent* C. 23 *manducarunt*] *manducauerunt* B1, B2, C, D, E.

corruptionem [Ps 16,10]. Sed panis consecratus corrumpitur et a muribus comeditur, vt patet experientia. Ergo, panis consecratus non est Christus.

Sed maxime, admisso illo quod Christus in cena verbo virtutis suae panem transsubstantiauit, aut ita corpus suum illi vniuit vt vere et simpliciter dicatur: 'Christus est id quod est panis', sine aliqua expositione (et iam huic simile non reperies in tota Scriptura a Christo vel discipulis factum, quos dixerat tamen omnia et maiora facturos, Iohan. XIII. [Io 1,51]), non tamen adhuc sequitur, si Christus hoc fecit, quemlibet sacrificulum hoc facere posse.

Videamus ergo quibus verbis tanta potestas data sit hominibus. Dicunt Romani per haec verba: *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem* [ICor 11,24]. At iam incertum est an verba ista sic sint exponenda: 'hoc quod ego facio, facite', vel: 'hoc quod vos facitis, facite in meam commemorationem'. Si primum exponendi modum accipimus, iterum in incerto stamus cum certum non habeamus quid ipse fecerit. Sunt enim qui dicunt (vt recitat Erasmus in annotatione Epist. I. ad Corinth. XI.) Christum prius consecrasse panem et postea haec verba *Hoc est corpus meum* enunciasse de pane iam transsubstantiato. Sed esto quod per illa verba consecrauit *Hoc est* etc., quis iam audebit corpus Christi ore sumere et comedere absque mandato Christi? Mandatum autem non habemus sumendi, si *Hoc facite* ad consecrantes, non ad sumentes debet referri. Nam quae in Iohanne sunt, non de oris, sed fidei manducatione intelliguntur.

Si vero dixerit quis verba praedicta significare: 'hoc quod vos facitis, facite', quod est, corpus meum comedite, et cum non sit inter mortales qui hoc posset dare, quid ergo faciemus? Exspectabimusne donec ipse Christus veniat atque ministret aut alium mittat qui hoc possit dare quod iussi sumus sumere? Vel si alicui dedit hanc potestatem, per quae verba dedit rogo. Non potest haec oratio *Hoc facite* duo significare neque *hoc* singularis numeri plura demonstrare.

Sunt qui dicunt factum apostolorum demonstrari, et quia hoc non possunt facere nisi sit qui administret, ergo implicite intelligi Christum dedisse potestatem administrandi et hoc toti ecclesiae, quae habet ordinare ad hoc personas certas, quemadmodum facit ordinando sacerdotes. Obscura sunt haec et tenebrosa nimis. Admissis tamen istis,

12 commemorationem] recordationem C. 15 *in incerto*] *incerto* C. 26 *inter mortales*] *immortalis* C. 31 *plura*] *plu* A.

quaero quos panes consecrat sacerdos dicendo verba praemissa? Tantum, inquiunt, illos quos intendit demonstrare per illud pronomen *hoc* in consecratione prolatum. Ergo laicus, qui de consecrantis intentione non potest esse certus, cogitur credere esse Christum; quod an Christus sit, certo scire non potest, nec vnquam laici erunt certi verumne sacramentum accipiant necne. Certe abyssus multa religio haec!

Sed relinquamus ista et consecrationis verba examinemus. Et sunt haec: *Accepit Iesus panem, benedixit, fregit deditque discipulis suis, dicens: Hoc est corpus meum* [cf. ICor 11,23–24; Mt 26,26–29; Mc 14,22–25; Lc 22,19–20]. Iam consecrans vel dicit haec verba in persona sua, vel ecclesiae, vel Christi. Si in sua, suum corpus videtur verius conficere quam Domini. Si in persona Christi, non bene conueniunt verba *benedixit, fregit*, quae potius sunt Christi factum rememorantis quam in eiusdem persona loquentis. Neque dixit Christus: 'hoc facite meo nomine', sed *in mei commemorationem*. Alias quemadmodum in baptismo dicit minister: 'Ego baptizo te in nomine etc.', ita hic dicendum foret: 'benedico, frango et do, etc.' Neque recte nodus iste soluitur dicendo consecrantem loqui in persona propria cum dicit: *Benedixit, fregit, deditque discipulis suis, dicens*, et post illud verbum *dicens* ipsum incipere loqui in persona Christi, quia contra hanc solutionem pugnat verbum *effundetur* in benedictione calicis. Vbi ergo esset dicendum *qui effusus est*, nisi velis personam ibi mutare contra omnem sensum communem. Iam videre licet quam obscura et incerta sunt omnia a Romanis nostris hic asserta, quae nec stare possint nisi commentis fulciantur humanis. Quare melius manendum existimo in verbo simplicissimo Christi: *Si quis dixerit vobis quia hic est Christus, nolite credere.*

Est praeterea quod fidem Romanam reddit suspectam, quia, cum articulus iste esset singularis et primo forte loco ponendus, non tamen collocatur in symbolo, vt aiunt, apostolico. In decretalibus autem Papae religiose de ea tractatur in titulo 1 et capite 1 decretalium. Quae res etiam auget suspicionem, papisticum esse inuentum vel satanae potius, quod nec puto aliquem infitias iturum, qui prius tacite secum reuoluerit quam caute tota religio papistica sit supra hoc fundamentum fundata. Christus qui sola fide cernitur, sola fide colitur, qui docuit corporalia seruitia proximo impendenda, ipsi autem seruiendum in spiritu

---

3 *consecrantis*] *consecrandi* C. 5 *verumne*] *vtrumne* C. 14 *loquentis*] *loquentibus* A. | *meo nomine*] *in meo nomine* C, *in meo nomine* E. 17 *nodus iste soluitur*] *soluitur nodus iste* B1, B2, C, D, E. 23 *asserta*] *inserta* B1, B2, C, D, E. 29 *symbolo*] *simbolo* A. 31 *satanae*] *Sathanae* A. 33 *fundamentum*] *fundamento* A. 35 *spiritu*] *spiritum* A, B1, B2.

per fidem, quo hoc facilius fieret, corporalem praesentiam nobis subtraxit, quam obesse discipulis testatus est, dicens: *Si non abiero, Paracletus non veniet* [Io 16,7]. Satan vt omnia peruerteret, corporalem Christi praesentiam persuadere est conatus et licet non in specie hominis, in specie tamen panis. At panis qui oculis corporalibus cernitur, si Deus esse creditur, corporalibus eget seruitiis. Indignum enim esset Deum humili casa concludi, aut inclusum sine honore relinqui. Hinc ergo templa sumptuosa et ornatus templorum, hinc lampades et taedae, hinc vestes sacrae ex bysso et auro contextae, hinc boatus monachorum in choro, unctio sacerdotum et castimonia, hinc pars sacramenti laicis aufertur. Et breuiter, si illud subtraxeris, ruet vniuersa religio Papae, quam aliquando casuram quis dubitabit, cum eam modo magna ex parte videas cecidisse? Humanum ergo commentum est in quo fundatur, quia si supra petram esset posita, contra omnes procellas staret inuicta.

Non ergo per haec verba *Hoc est corpus meum* Saluator panem transsubstantiari voluit, sed per panem seipsum dare. Sicut mos est quibusdam in locis, quando venditor agri possessionem vult tradere emptori, dat ei baculum, stramen aut lapidem et dicit: 'Ecce, trado tibi agrum', item possessio domus datur per traditionem clauium, sic etiam Dominus per panem seipsum tradit nobis, quasi dixisset: 'Accipite et comedite et nolite aestimare paruum, quia hoc quod trado vobis, significat corpus meum, quod do vobis dando istud. Quando ergo illud tradetur aut in cruce pendetur, erit pro vobis; imo, omnia quae feci aut faciam vestra sunt.' Magna est consolatio ista et dulcissima verba si recte contemplentur.

Nec sine causa dictum est 'est' pro 'significat', quia 'est' multo certius et vehementius praedictum sensum facit, sicut dicimus demonstrando signum pluuiae: 'hoc est pluuia', quod certius repraesentat pluuiam futuram quam si diceremus: 'hoc significat pluuiam'. Et similibus locutionibus plena est Scriptura, vt Gen. XL: *Tres propagines tres adhuc dies sunt* [Gn 40, 12], similiter: *Tria canistra tres adhuc dies sunt* [Gn 40,18], et in sequenti capite: *Septem boves pulchrae et septem spicae plenae septem vbertatis anni sunt* [Gn 41,26]. Et similia abundant exempla. Romani autem pro sua expositione vnum exemplum dare non poterunt, nec demonstrare vbi Christus creditur fecisse miraculum contra omnem experientiam.

---

1 *quo*] *et quo* A, B1, B2, C, D, E. 3 *Satan*] *Sathan* A. 10 *choro*] *choris* C. 18 *in locis*] *incolis* C. | *venditor*] *vendito* D. 35–36 *nec demonstrare … miraculum*] omisit C.

Caecos illuminauit, mortuos suscitauit, leprosos mundauit [cf. Mt 11,5], sed ita vt omnibus viderentur mundati, viuentes et videntes, non solum crederentur tales contra experientiam. Talia vero miracula Papa et sui facere solent, qui ex pessimo nebulone, lenone aut pirata facit patrem sanctum et reuerendum episcopum, non quod videatur per experientiam sanctior aut sapientior quam erat prius, sed creditur sanctus ac sapiens. Similiter multa miracula facit, liberando animas a purgatorio, vel dimittendo certas partes poenarum a Deo infligendarum pro peccatis (forsan pro pecuniis), vel etiam omnes, vt creditur a miseris, contra omnem experientiam, quia tempore pestilentiae aut belli nihil mitius sentiunt ii quibus omnis poena est remissa aliis nullam remissionem habentibus.

Diiudicemus ergo inter panem ore susceptum et Christum quem fide accipimus; quod si quis non diiudicaret corpus Domini, putans se nihil aliud accipere quam quod ore suscipit, reus est corporis et sanguinis Domini et manducat sibi iudicium et bibit [ICor 11,29], quia bibendo et manducando ostendit sibi adesse Christum cum tamen ipse desit Christo per infidelitatem. Misereatur ergo nostri Deus! Quanta videtur esse abominatio ista! Filii Israel liberati de manu Pharaonis et pane de caelo saturati, recesserunt cito de via quam ostendit eis Moses, feceruntque sibi vitulum conflatilem et adorauerunt, atque immolantes hostias ei, dixerunt: *Isti sunt dii tui, Israel, qui te eduxerunt de terra Aegypti* [Ex. 32,4]. At nos Christiani cito recedentes a verbo Christi, ducis nostri, dicentis: *Si quis dixerit vobis, hic est Christus, nolite credere* [Mt 24,23], panem eleuamus et dicimus: 'Hic est Deus noster qui nos redemit sanguine suo'. Detestandum hoc est.

Neque audiendos puto qui dicunt, corpus Christi esse in pane sicut ignis in ferro, nisi non audiamus Christum dicentem: *Si dixerint, in penetralibus est Christus, nolite credere* [Mt 24,26].

Dei tui verbum est, lector: *Non in solo pane viuit homo, sed in omni verbo quod procedit de ore Dei* [Mt 4,4]. Non dicit Dominus: 'in hoc vel illo verbo', sed: 'in omni'. Nos autem relictis omnibus verbis quae Christus in vltima illa cena sua locutus est, solum ea nobis adsumpsimus: *Hoc est corpus meum et hic calix nouum testamentum est in meo sanguine* etc. Super quibus tot iam conscripti sunt libri quod vix mense vno quis eos legere posset. Sed nostra culpa est, qui tales meremur scriptores, quod relin-

10 *mitius*] *nimus* C, *minus* D, E. 13 *ergo*] omisit C. 20 *eis*] *ei* C. 22 *Aegypti*] *egipti* A. 30 *Dei tui verbum*… homo] omisit C.

quimus fontem aquarum viuentium diuertimusque ad cisternas veteres [cf. Ier 2,13]. Omne Dei verbum audiendum est et solum Dei verbum est audiendum, nihil nobis est liberum. Omnis doctrina nobis prohibita est et omne verbum praeter Christi verbum, quia haec dicit Dominus: *Oues meae vocem meam audiunt, alienorum vocem non audiunt* [cf. Io 10,3–5]. Quid igitur dicis tibi liberum esse loqui et facere quod Dominus non prohibet? Si tu es ouis Christi, non audies eos qui talia dicunt: nonne Christi verbum praecipit et vetat? Quid fratri tuo subuentum est, si omnes consecratas (vt aiunt) hostias comederis et omnes vini calices biberis? Dicis mihi: 'ego habeo praeceptum Domini, quod mihi dicit: *hoc facite in mei recordationem*'; quasi Christus in eadem cena non abunde satis docuerit quid velit nos facere, quae omnia Iohannes euangelista quinque capitibus describit a decimo tertio incipiens vsque ad decimum octauum.

Audi, audi, Israel, verba Domini Dei tui! Haec dicit Dominus: *Quaecunque vni ex minimis his non fecistis, mihi non fecistis* [cf. Mt 25,45]. Cauete falsos doctores, cauete falsos Christos. *Multi venient*, dicit Dominus, *in nomine meo, dicentes: 'ego sum Christus', et seducent multos* [Mt 24,5]. Olim dicebant: 'Ego sum Thomae, ego Scoti, Hieronymi, Augustini, Francisci etc.' Nunc qui veniunt, dicunt: 'Ego sum Christus', interim tamen dilacerant fratrem, multi auari sunt, sui amantes et quae Dei sunt negligentes, nihil minus quam charitatem sectantes: *a fructibus eorum cognoscetis eos*, dicit Dominus [Mt 7,16]. *At in hoc cognoscent omnes quod mei sitis, si dilectionem habueritis ad inuicem* [Io 13,35]. Certe et hi quae placita sunt populo loquuntur, veram illam Christi doctrinam, quae docet semper iniuriam ferendam, nunquam inferendam, non resistendum malo, sed in bono vincendum malum, ei qui aufert quae tua sunt, non contradicendum, petenti dimidietatem possessionis, relinquendam totam, nemo inculcat. Omnis ille Christi sermo in monte factus penitus negligitur, in quo Christus Christianum hominem instituit atque omnia quae docuit in vltima illa cena per compendium declarat. Haec non docentur, aut si docentur, frigide et iuxta praescriptum humanum adhuc, quare sine fructu et sine Spiritu, qui si non adest, non possumus recordari omnium Christi verborum. Nec aderit quam diu carnalem eius credimus praesentiam, quia vt dicit ipse: *Si non abiero, Paracletus non veniet* [Io 16,7].

---

3 *est audiendum*] *audiendum est* C. 15 *audi*] omisit C. 16 his] hiis A. 19 *ego Scoti*] *ego Schoti* A, *ego sum Schoti* B1, B2, D, E. 24 *hi*] *hii* A. 25 *illam*] *istam* C. 26 *non*] omisit C. 34 *aderit*] *adderit* A.

Haec, pie lector, obiter tibi scripsimus, veram Dominici corporis manducationem et sanguinis potationem breui emissuri, si id voluerit Deus. Interim ora ne deficiat fides nostra vtque verae oues veram Pastoris non alienorum vocem audiamus.

THE GERMAN TRANSLATION OF THE *EPISTOLA CHRISTIANA* OF 1526 (AUGSBURG), INCLUDING THE PREFACE

Editorial principles: The text has been modernized. So-called "allemanische Diphthonge", the use of 'v' for 'u' and 'j' for 'i' and the use of capitals have been normalized according to current usage. Abbreviations have been expanded and the 'Ringel'-s has been transcribed as 'sz'. References to biblical texts and the pagination of the original text have been included in the text in square brackets. The original division of the paragraphs has been maintained.

| EIN CHRISTLICHER BERICHT VON DEM BROT VND WEYN DESZ HERREN A1r

M.D.XXVI
Im Augustmonat

| Vorred in disen Sandtbrief und Bericht das Nachtmal desz Herren betreffendt. A2r

Diser Christlich bericht und Sendbrieff, Christlicher leeser, geet one desz Senders aufgezaychneten namen ausz, zu vermeyden drey grosse treffenlich und schedliche ursachen. Die erst, das biszher lange zeyt, ja bald nach den Apostelen und botten Jesu Christi, alle Interpretes und auszleger desz wort Gottes, iren namen auf die bücher (so sy über das sibenfältig rayn lauter und probiert wort, Psal. 11 [Ps 11,7], gemacht) geschriben und verzaichnet haben, darausz zu handt, wie volgt, sollich treffenlich schaden erwachsen ist. Nemlich, so ain emsiger leeser vnd verklerer der hailigen schrifft (wie zum tayl der alten scribenten befunden werden) gewest, ist yederman zugefaren dem verklerer und auszleger desz wort Gottes, dises das Got zugehört gegeben und zugemessen. Als wenn sy ainen spruch der hailigen schrifft mit dem andern (wie man allweg thun soll) heller und verstendiger gemacht haben, hat

man gesagt: "das sagt diser leerer, das ain anderer", und haben also den leerern und auszlegern (das allain Gott und seynen ainigen wort gebürt) zugeschriben. Daher dann kommen ist die haimlich schedlich hoffart der leerer, das sich ain yetzlicher, Namens und eytler eer halben, in seiner auszlegung über den anderen zu sein beflissen hat. Derwegen der schrifft vil zusetz an vil orten von aignem frevel und hyrnmütigkait von inen gegeben und also ursach ainer wider den anderen zu schreyben genommen, ain yetlicher sein Opinion und mainung zu verfechten understanden. Das ist eben die ursach der manicherlay weg und Sec-
A2v ten, das man gesagt hatt: "Ich bin | Tertulianisch, Cyprianisch, oder ich halt den weg Jheronymi, Augustini" etc. Daher haben auch die Hohenschulen solcher leerer weg auszerkorn. An ainem ort haben sy sich auff den weg Thome, davon sy Thomisten, am andern ort nach dem weg Scoti, davon sy Scotisten genannt sein, gerichtet. Und ist auff die letzt dahin kommen, das die Römer ire etlich ausz inen auszgeschlossen und allain für die vier Seülen der Kirchen (So doch die Christlich Kirch auff kain ander Seül noch fundament, 1 Cor. 3 [1 Cor 3,11], Dann allain auff das ainig ewig fundament vnd grundt Christum gebawet ist) geachtet und gezelet haben. Das ist der erst langkwirdig, treffenlich schad also starck zu unseren yetzigen letsten zeytten eingewurtzlet, das man auch unverschampt gebieten und schliessen darff, das das wort Gottes nicht anderst dann nach diser vier leerer auszlegung gepredigt soll werden, So doch Christus offentlich, Joan. 5 [Io 5,39], die schrifft von ime zeygent zu erforschen (nicht Thomam, oder Scotum, Noch Augustinum oder Jheronymum etc.) fürwirfft. "Dann sy ists", spricht er, "die zeügknus von mir gibet", darmit er dann Moisen und Propheten allain auff in richtet, wie das durch die zwen Cherubin, das ist, durch die zway angesicht mit auszgebraiten flügelen über den genadenstul auff der laden des bunds, Exo. 25 [Ex 25,18–22], gefiguriert ist, dann ire angesicht müsten den genadenstuel ansehen zu bedeüten das alt und New Testament allain disen gnadenstuel Christum, Ro. 3 [Ro 3,21–31], Uns durch den glauben zu erkennen solten geben. Wa beleyben dann die da sprechen, man möge die schrifft one der leerer auszlegung nicht versteen? Wie besteen dise, die yetz zu unsern zeyten (darinn sy die schrifft zu haben vermainen) one etlicher Doctoren der hohen plustigen Titel, verstand und erklerung die schrifft nicht verstanden werden, für und für hart und halsznegkisch zwingen? Darmit sy dann die yetzigen leerer und auszleger der schrift die sollich hoff-
A3r art gefürt haben. Das nun kaines dem an-|dern in seiner leer weychen will, Es sey wider die schrifft oder mit der schrift, so will ain yetlicher

ain Doctor, Rabbi oder Maister beleyben, kain discipel und leerjunger werden. Und ee dann sy weychen wolten, müszten ee alle schrift sich biegen, Christus sich zuruck treyben, Ja auff die letst gar ausz dem mittel stossen lassen. Als dann in disem puncten desz herren Nachtmal belangend, hell und klar gespürt und gesehen würdt, Da haben etlich wesenlich und Corperlich flaisch und blut Christi in desz herren brot und weyn zu sein vermaint, Auch das offenlich gelernet und schrifftlich in die gemain mitsampt iren aignen angehefften namen auszlassen gien, one angesehen hell treffenlich sprüch der hailigen schrifft, die das nicht leyden noch besteen mögen, Sonder offenlich wider drey Artickel desz glauben ist, geschweig anderer sprüch Christi und der Apostelen, die sy all falsch und lugenhafftig machen, so doch Christus in irsalen die schrifft haist erforschen, Jo. 5 [Io 5,39]. Wie auch die Thessalonienser die obresten untter inen alle tag fleyssig die schrift ersuchten, Act. 17 [Act 17,11], Ob die leer Pauli recht und in schrifften gegründt were. So sprechen die yetzigen leerer, du solt kain andere schrifft annemen, hast zeügknusz genug an den drey Evangelisten und Paulo, die da sprechen: "Das ist mein leyb der fuer euch dargeben wirdt", und sehen nicht, das es als ain wort ist, und obgleych hundert weren die das wider äfereten oder nenneten, so wer es nur ain zeügknusz ains worts oder spruchs oder geschichts ainmal also gehandelt, dann ye der Evangelisten im schreyben kainer wider den anderen ist, dann sy all ain Christum, ain leer und geschicht ainhellig (als obs ausz ainem mund geredt wurde) auszdrucken, dasz auch also Paulus zeüget, 1. Cor. 11 [I Cor 11,23–26], so er spricht: "Ich habs vom herren entpfangen". Was? "Desz herren brot und weyn." Auch seyn leyb und blut darinn? Nain, dann er ist erst über etlich vil jar, nach der auffart Christi zum glauben vom herren berüfft worden, Act. 9 [Act 9,1–19]. Sonder | Paulus sagt: "Ich habs A3v
vom herren empfangen" etc., als wolt er sagen Wie ander leer durch den gayst, nemlich, wie er gehandelt und geredet hat im Nachtmal mit seinen jungeren, und hebt an und nennet und widerholet auch eben die wort (so die Evangelisten im Nachtmal vom herren geredt) zeügen. Sy wöllen aber Paulum nit hören noch halten, der allain unter allen Evangelisten und Apostelen das Nachtmal beschreybt, Nemlich, wie es gehalten soll werden und was wir darinn essen und trincken, und warumb man das thun soll, vnd was frücht darausz volgen, das man ausz kainem Evangelisten oder anderen Apostelen nicht lernen mag, so nennet er ye in den zway Capiteln der Ersten zu den Corinthern am 10. und 11. über all das brot desz herren brot und nicht den leyb Christi, auch den kelch weyn und nicht das blut Christi, das dann

geweltig zwinget (wie auch sunst vil ander schrifft hie von kürtzwegen auszgelassen) das dise wort: "Das ist mein leyb der für euch geben wirdt" etc. ain anderen verstandt haben und doch gantz vnverruckt, nach dem buchstaben, wie sy ligen, beleyben müssen. Sehet, lieben brüder, was unradt ausz dem auffgezaichneten namen auff die Bücher erwachsen ist und noch alle tag erwechst?

Die ander ursach ist, das von des leerers namen wegen, das wort Gottes verklaynert, geschmecht und gelestert wirdt, dann es ist auch von anfang also geschehen, wirdt noch wol so bleyben. Als bald ain name aines lerers den Römischen verdächtlich oder verbittert wurde, zuhand ward dasselbig buch von inen verdampt, Ketzerisch geacht und auffs nechst durchs fewer auszgedilgket, on angesehen ob die schrifft recht oder falsch von dem leerer gehandelet und auszgelegt wurde. Also ist das wort Gottes offtmals von inen nydergedruckt und verhindert worden, wie ich dann ettlich leerer Namen nach ordnung (so ich nicht
A4^{r} meer schaden denn nutz darausz künfftig be-|sorgte) erzelen möchte. Eben also geschicht es noch heütte, so ain buch (wie recht und wol in schrifften gegründet) mit aines leerers namen von den Römern verdächtlich verzaichnet wirdt, Als bald hört man ain geschray: "Es ist Ketzerey, verbietens, verbietens, und auffs nechst ins fewer", und wolten noch geren bergen, das sy mit verderblichen schaden, seel und leyb belangend, verhalten haben.

Ist das nicht die gröst Gottslesterung und höchste schmach, das Gott und sein wort von aines armen sündigen kottsacks namen wegen geschmecht, veracht und verworffen soll werden? Ja, sprichstu, das wort und Got wirdt nicht dardurch geschmecht oder sein Eer verklaynert, sonder der irsall desz der die schrift übel und vnrecht handelt. Antwurt, Den irsal solstu, ee du den namen desz leerers verdammest, schmehest, und zu boden stossest, ungerecht und verdamlich beweysen, Und das nicht ausz deinem kopff oder guttduncken, sonder mitt schrifft, Welche allain uns in allen irsalen entrichten soll vnd mag, Nicht mitt langkwirigem brauch, altem herkommen etc., Sonder ob es wol braucht und nicht wider die schrifft angenommen und gehalten sey.

Die Dritt ursach, das die hailig schrifft (so von etlichen leerern, deren namen auff den büchlen steen, recht gehandelet) nicht geleesen, sonder als Ketzerisch und verfürisch geacht und vermitten wirdt, Als sonderlich sich bey jungen zeyten mit den büchern Johannis Hussen, Nach-

27–28 *Antwurt, Den irsal solstu, ee du*] *Antwurt, Den irsal solst ee vnd dann du.*

mals desz Luthers und yetz auff die letzst und am treffend mit Zwinglii, Ecolampadii und andern meer büchlen von desz Herren brot und weyn schreybent, sich begeben hat und noch alle tag begibt. Davon dann kompt, das man urtaylt, verdampt und Ketzerisch verbeüt, dasz man nye geleesen (geschweyg durch schrifft gerecht oder ungerecht, falsch, Ketzerisch und verfürisch) erwegen und | bewysen hat. Dise schedliche A4v drey ursachen zu vermeyden, so far hin lieber Christlicher bericht von desz Herren brot und weyn. Christelich nenne ich dich, dann also hayst dein name, und wer dich tadelt, der thü es mit Christlichen, Apostolischen und Prophetischen schrifften, und doch das also das kain schrifft die andern schwech oder lugenhafftig mach. Dann dein Autores und leerer, Christus, Paulus, Moises und Propheten, haben nye geleert und offenlich dein volck verkündigt, das ains dem andern wider und entgegen gewest wer, dann der gayst Gottes und Gott selbist Ist nicht ain Gott der zwitracht, sonder des frydes, wie in allen gemainen der hailigen, 1. Cor. am 14. [ICor 14,33]. Und will dir gleych zu glücklichem willfar wünschen, wie Moises Deutero. am 32. [Dt 32,2] thut, und sagen: "Far hin und dein leer trieff wie der Regen und dein Rede flyesse wie der Thaw, wie der regen auff das grasz, und wie die tropffen auff das kraut", Das ist, sey fruchtbar und hailwertig, Kum hörer und leeser über die dich entpfahen, fassen, und im Gayst lernen und frücht bringen ins Ewig leben. Amen.

| 1 Corinth. 11 B1r

Ir mögen nicht essen desz Herren Nachtmal, dann ain yeder nympt zuvor sein aygen Abentmal under dem essen

Unser herr Jesus Christus hat verzeyhung vil mal verhaissen und am letsten was sein fürnemen seiner Jünger gemüter zu bestettigen. Deszhalb er der verhayssung ain pfandt angehenckt auff das sy nicht etlichermasz zweyfelten. Gleich wie ain breutgam zu befestigen seinen willen, gibt er der braut ainen fingerring. 'Nym hin' (sagt er) 'ich begib mich dir'. Welche den ring mit frewden annimpt und glaubt das der gemahel ir sey und keret ir gemut von yederman auffdas sy iren Eegemahel allain gefalle. Auff dise weysz hat die gemain Gottes das brot und weyn von Christo angenommen als ain pfandt irs gemahels welcher bezeüget das er sich ir ergeben hab. Solle auch bestendigklich glauben das Christus ir sey, das er umb iren willen in todt geben und sein blut vergossen hab. Deszhalb sy ir gemuet von allem abwenden soll das sy

zuvor geliebt hat, auffdas sy Christo allain anhange, allain suche das im gefellt, über sich nicht mer sorgfältig sey, sonder alle sorg in Christum werffe von dem sy glaubt das er ir aygen sey und ir überflissig genug sey zu allen dingen. Das haiszt warlich Christum essen und sein blut trincken, wie er selbs sagt, Jo. 6 [Io 6,57]: *Wer mein flaisch ysset und trinckt mein blut, der bleybt in mir und ich in im*. Welche aber on disen glauben desz Herren Nachtmal begeen, die essen der Juden Manna und nicht Christum.

– Aber die Römischen schulen haben dises lebhafftigen glaubens nicht gedacht, sonder ain andern todten und unnützen glauben
B1v geleert. Sy bereden sich ja, es sey | genug das man glaube das nach der Consecration der ware leyb Christi zugegen sey.

Wie aber das zugehe, understeen sy durch vil subtiler mittel, doch on alle schrifft anzuzaigen. Sollicher glaub seyttemal er nur der historien nach ist, mag nyemandt selig machen, das ist offenbar genug.

– Ob aber sollicher glaub nit on ursach angenommen und nicht zu verdammen sey, wöllen wir yetzundt erforschen. Dann wir befinden, das durch disen glauben das Consecriert brot angebettet und auf alle weysz für Got gehalten wirdt.

Was ist nun underschayd zwischen uns und den Hayden die holtz und staine anbetten, wa disz brot nicht Gott ist? Jhene vermainten es wer etwas Götlichs in iren götzen, das doch nit was, und würden zwar die stain nicht haben angebettet, wa sy nicht ausz grobem frevel etwas Götlichs bey inen geglaubt hetten.

– Wa yemandt sagt: 'Wir haben das wort gottes, Nemlich, *Disz ist mein leyb*'. Es ist war, ir haben das wort Gottes das ir auch zu beschirmen des Bapsts tyranney gehapt haben, da die schrift sagt zu Petro, *Was du bindest auff erdtrich* etc. [Mt 16,19]. Welchs ausz fleyssiger erforschung befunden ist als unkrefftig für der Bäpstler schadhaftig öberkait. Darumb lassen uns auch gegenwertig wort ersuchen das wir nicht blinden fürern nachfolgen, sampt in graben fallen und verderben [cf. Mt 15,14]. Seyttemal der Herr verbotten hat den zu glauben so uns sagen das da oder dort Christus sey [Mt 24,23], deszhalb ich den nitt glauben soll die da sagen das Christus im Consecrierten brot sey. Wie möchte ich mich alsz unwissend verfürt entschuldigen, wenn ich die verwarnung Christi nicht hab wöllen annemen? Yetzundt seind die gefärlichen zeyt in welcher nach der red Christi solliche ding beschehen.

– Die Apostel haben von disem Sacrament geredt | auff nachgeende form: Er nam das brot, Er brach das brot etc. Brot haben sy es genandt und des Römischen glaubens gar verschwigen. B2r

Paulus 1 Cor. 10 [1 Cor 10,16] ist nicht dawider. *Das brot* (sagt er) *das wir brechen, ist das nitt die gemainschafft des leybs Christi*? Aber er sagt nit: 'Das brot ist der leyb Christi', sonder 'die gemainschaft' etc. Will also unleugbar sein das an dem ort das wörtlin 'ist' für 'bedeüttet' genommen wirt. Das offenbar wirt ausz der vergleychung des brots und der götzen opffer. Bey welchen in der warhait nichts verwandelt ist, doch sagt er, das sy 'sein' oder 'bedeütten' ain gemainschafft mit dem teüffel dem sy geopffert sein. Darausz er schleüst, das sy zu meyden sein, sy würden denn on underschayd angenommen und gessen.

– Es seind etlich zu den zeyten Thome Aquinas gewesen die sagten das Christus im brot were, aber als in aim zaichen. Das haben die andern mit disen worten angezaigt 'sacramentlich, aber nit leyplichen'. Wiewol Thomas dise mainung als kätzerisch verwirfft, dem die Römer als ainer gewisen stimm Gottes anhangen, doch mögen sy die wort Christi nicht verantworten: *Wann euch yemant sagt, hie ist Christus, sollen ir nicht glauben* [Mt 24,23]. Darzu auch dienet das Paulus an gezaigtem ort sagt: *Unser vätter in der wüste haben alle ainerlay gaistliche speysze mit uns gessen* [cf. 1 Cor 10,1–6].
– Laszt uns zu ersten besehen mit was grund die Römer ir leer understützen, die so seltzam und ungehört ist das dergleychen wunder nicht gefunden wirdt in aller geschrift. Wir leesen das Christus sey mensch worden, aber das nur ain mal und im leyb der Junckfrawen Maria, welchs doch vil propheten vorgesagt, Christus durch sein leben, tod und beywonung bewisen, und die Apostel gepredigt haben.
– Das aber Christus alle tag brot wirt under den henden ains yetlichen Mezlings, ist von kaim Propheten als zukünftig angezaigt, von kaim Apostel als beschehen ver-|kündiget, sonder allain steet es auff disen ainigen worten das Christus gesaget hat: *Disz ist mein leyb. Das thun zu meiner gedechtnusz*. Wa nun Christus ir fürgeben gewölt hette, wer uns warlich das selbig ainig wort gnug. Aber das ist zu verwundern, warumb sy nicht ausz gleycher ursach sagen das Johannes der Teüffer sey in Heliam verwandelt, so Christus von im sagt: *Er ist Helias*, Matthei am 11. [Mt 11,14], oder der Evangelist in Christum, da der Herre am Creütz zur mutter von im also redet: *Weyb, syhe dein sun* [Io 19,26], Und fürtter der felsz B2v

in Christum, so Paulus sagt: *Der felsz war Christus* [I Cor 10,4], das ist, er zaygt an Christum. Warumb wöllen sy sollichen verstandt in disen wortten nicht zugeben, seyttemal er gesagt hat, man soll es zu seiner gedechtnus thun? Und gemaine art der rede ain gedechtnus für des so nicht zugegen ist gedenckzaichen annympt und versteet.

– Mich gedunckt, das die gewonhait ursach sey das die oren von disem verstand ain abschewhen tragen, den sy an andern gleichen orten on beschwerd zugeben, sunst waysz ich kain ursach. Vil gleycher ort möchten fürbracht werden, da sich Christus ain thür [Io 10,7–9], ain weg [Io 14,6], ain stain [Mt 21,42] nennet, und Johannis 15 [Io 15,1]: 'Ich bin', sagt er, 'ain ware reb'. Daselbst sein wir nit so rauch, das wir Christum zu ainer waren natürlichen reben machten. Was dringt uns anders in disem ort, dann des Bapsts gwalt und ansehen?

– Zu weyterem verstandt ist zu bedencken, das dreyerlay gaystlich brot ist: Christus den man im glauben ysset, Johannis am 6. [Io 6,51], das Man, so die vätter in der wüste gessen haben [cf. Io 6,49], und der Christen Eucharistia, dasz ist des Herren brot, von dem wir yetzund handeln. Von den ersten zwayen liszt man Johannis am 6.: *Ich bin das brot des leben, ewer vätter haben gessen das Man und seind gestorben, disz brot ist vom himmel gestigen, wer dauon ysset, würt nit sterben* [Io 6,48–50]. Hie eröffnet Christus
B3r den under-|schayd zwischen der Juden brot, das in der wüste den Juden vom hymel kam, und zwischen im selbs, der ain brot ist das er selbs wolte geben für das leben der welt. Der Juden brot bedeüttet das Christus solte von hymel kommen zu aim leben der welt. Es was aber nit das lebendig brot, wie uns Christus ist, und gab kain leben, darumb die es gessen haben, sein gestorben. Welliche aber Christum essen, werden nitt sterben, sonder ewiglich leben.

Vom dritten haben wir Paulum in der ersten zu den Corinthern am zehenden [I Cor 10,1–17], der saget, das es eben ain gaystlich speysz sey der Juden mit unserm brot, das wir brechen zur gedechtnus Christi, welcher vom hymel gestygen ist zum leben der welt. Auff das hie bedeüttet werde als volbracht, das bey den alten durchs Man bedeüttet ward als zukünfftig. Deshalb ist unser brot nitt das lebhafftig hymelbrot, dann es vil essen und dennocht sterben. Wie der Kinder Israel durchgang durchs rot Meer bedeüttet hat den durchgang zum ewigen leben durch den tod, doch seind nit alle die durchs Meer gangen sein,

zum leben kommen, sonder allain die so mit dem zukünfftigen Christo durch den glauben gestorben sein. Auch bedeüttet unser Tauff ain durchgang zum leben durch den todt zu welchen nit alle getauffte kommen, dann allain die so mit dem gestorbenen Christo sterben, durch den glauben, die ersteen mit im durch den selbigen glauben. Also das Man in der wüste bedeüttet Christum das lebendig brot, das vom ewigen todt verhüttet, aber nicht alle sein darvon behuettet worden die das Man gessen haben, sonder die allain die den zukünftigen Christum im glauben gessen haben. Dann das Man bedeüttet Christum, es was aber nicht Christus. Deszgleychen ist im Sacrament des brots, wie Paulus bezeüget. Darumb wie das Man nit was das es bedeüttet, dann die es gessen haben seind nit alle vom ewigen todt verhüttet, Johannis am 6. | [Io 6,48–50], also auch ist unser brot nicht Christus den es ausz gleycher ursach bedeüttet. Es behüttet zwar nitt vom ewigen todt, die es essen. B3v

– Deszhalben ermanet Paulus [ICor 10,6] das wir nicht des bösen begeren und uns nicht gefallen umbs Tauffs und des Herren brots willen, als ob wir durch den Tauff und desz Herren brot ettwas weytters hetten dann die Juden oder als ob wir die sach und allen grundt warlich hetten, die Juden allain die zaichen. Welches nitt ist, dann der Apostel sagt das eüwer gaystlich speysz ist eben die speysz der vätter, und wie er so die väter gesündet, nichts übersehen hatt, also wirdt er ewer auch nicht verschonen wa ir nicht haben ain thätigen glauben, der durch die liebe gutts thue, durch welchen allain die vätter und wir zu gleych das ding erlangen so durch ir und unsere zaichen bedeüttet ist. Das befestigt der 15. Psalm: *dein hailigen würstu nicht lassen die zerstörung sehen* [Ps 16,10], ist geredt von Christo, aber das Consecriert brot verdirbt und wirdt von Meüssen fressen; das zwinget ye, das dises brot nitt sey Christus.
– Weytter ob man nachgeben wolt das Christus im Nachtmal durchs wort seiner kraft das brot in sein leyb verwandelt oder im sein leyb sunst eingeleybt habe, also das warlich und gerichts nach den worten Christus eben sey das brot ist, on weytern verstand, so befindestu in aller schrift nichts dergleychen von Christo oder seinen Jungern beschehen sein, zu welchen er gesagt hat, das sy grössers thun werden, Johannis am 13. [Io 1,51] Auch folget nit Christus hats gethon und sein leyb dem brot verainiget, darumb mag es ain yeglicher Meszling auch thun.

– Mit was worten ist doch solicher gewalt und macht den menschen geben? Die Römer sagen durch dise: *Das thund in meiner gedechtnusz*. Welches ungewisz ist. Dann die wort mögen auff zwayerlay
B4r weysz verstanden werden |: 'Das ich thu, das thund', oder: 'Das ir thun, das thund zu meiner gedechtnusz'. Wolte uns das erst gefallen, so wirt es aber ungewisz, dann es seind ettlich wie Erasmus 1. Corinth. 11 anzaigt, die sagen das Christus das brot zuvor Consecrieret hab, und darnach dise wort geredt: *das ist mein leyb* von dem Consecrierten brot. Ob man schon nachgebe, das mit disen worten: *Das ist mein leyb* Consecriert wurde, wer ist dann so frevel, das er den leyb Christi dürffe in den mund nemen und essen on befelch Christi? Nun haben wir kain gebott sollichs zu essen, wa das wörtlin (*das thund*) auff die Consecrierer und nitt auff die nyesser des Sacraments gezogen wirt, dann die wort Christi in Johanne reden klarlich nitt vom nyessen des mundts sonder vom essen des glaubens.

– Wölte aber das yemandt sagen, dasz dise wortt: *das thund in meiner gedechtnusz* seyen also zu versteen: 'das ir thun, das thun, das ist, mein leyb essen'. So nun under den menschen nyemandt ist, der sollichs vermög zu geben, was sollet wir dann thun? Sollen wir wartten bis Christus kompt und uns gebe, oder sunst ain andern send der sollichs mög geben das er uns hatt gehayssen nemen? Da sagen sy: 'Nayn, er hat ettlichen sollichen gewalt und macht geben'. Darauff frage ich: 'Lieber, durch welche wort?' Dann dise ainige red: *das thund zu meiner gedechtnusz* mag nit zway ding bedeüten, noch das wörtlin *das* mag nitt auff vil gezogen werden. Doch sagen die andern, das es der Apostel handlung anzayge, die sollichs gethon haben, das in unmüglich were, wa in den leyb Christi nyemandt geben hett oder sy sunst nitt den zu Consecrieren macht hetten, darumb zu verston sey, das Christus verborgenlich gewalt geben hab der gantzen gemain, die zu ordnen hatt benannte personen, als in der Priester weyhung beschieht. Dise antwurt ist verdunckelt und nitt werdt zu verlegen. Doch
B4v frag ich weytter, was | brots Consecriert der Priester mitt erzelten wortten? Da ist ir Antwurt: 'Allain die, so er willens ist zu bedeütten durch das wörtlin "das", welchs in der Consecrierung

19 *mein leyb essen*] *mein leyb den essen.*

das erst ist'. Was folget anders dann das der lay der nit wayst die maynung des Consecrierers, musz glauben das das Christus sey, das er doch nit wissen mag ob es Christus sey oder nit. Seyttemal des Meszlings fürnemen im allwegen musz unbeweyszt sein, folget ye das dem layen ungewisz ist ob das war Sacrament da sey oder nit. Welches warlich ain ungewyse Gotsehrung ist!

– Dergleychen ein red wöllen wir underlassen und weyters von worten die Consecrierung handeln, welche dise sein: *Jesus nam das brot, segnet es, brachs, und gabs seinen Jungern und sagt: 'Das ist mein leyb'*. Yetzund frag ich ob der Consecrierer dise wort sage in seiner person, oder in namen der gemain, oder Christi. Redt er in seiner person, so folget das er nit Christi, sonder sein aigen leyb Consecriert. So schickte es sich nicht, dasz er in der person Christi rede, dann gedachte wort dienen mer auff denen der die that Christi erzelet, weder in der person Christi redet. Zudem hat er nit gesaget: 'das thund in meinem namen', sonder: 'in meiner gedechtnusz'. Die art der rede erfordert, das der Meszling spreche zum brot: 'Ich segne, brich und gib dich im namen Christ' etc., wie der Tauffer in der person Gottes sagt: 'Ich teüffe dich im namen des Vatters und des suns und des hailigen gaysts'. Hie sagen sy: 'Die ersten wort: "Er nams, brachs, und gabs seinen Jungern, sprechende", die rede der Priester in sein selbs person, und nach dem wörtlin "sprechend" rede er in der person Christi'. Diese antwurt besteet nit, dieweyl in Consecrierung des Kelchs also geschriben ist: 'Disz ist mein blut etc., das für euch vergossen ist'; er müszte die wort endern und sagen: 'das für euch vergossen ist', solte er die that Christi erzelen. Darausz man syhet, wie gar ver-|dunckelt und C1r
ungewisz sein alle treüm der Römer so sy ins Nachtmal eingefüret haben. Were es nit besser, man blib in dem ainfaltigen wort Christi [Mt 24,23]: *Wann yemandt zu euch sagt, 'hie ist Christus, oder da', so solt irs nicht glauben.*

– Der Römer sach wirdt auch billich argkwenig, das so ain wichtiger Artickel der am fürnemsten solte eingebildet werden, nitt steet im glauben den man den Apostelglauben nennet. Aber in des Bapsts rechten im anfang des Decretals ist so fleyssig und aygentlich darvon geschriben. Das bringet argkwon und musz für ain Pfaffisten gedicht angesehen werden, ja für ain hauptpuncten des Satans, dann des Bapsts gaystlichait steet alle auff disem grund.

– Christus wirdt im glauben allain gesehen, im glauben allaine geert. Und hatt geleeret, das wir leypliche dienstparkait allain unserm nechsten erzaigen und im dienen im gayst durch den glauben. Darumb spricht er das die leiplich gegenwertigkait nicht hoch nütz zey und hat sy darumb hinweg von augen gethon. *Wenn ich* (sagt er) *nicht hinweg gehe, so wirdt der tröster nitt kommen* [Io 16,7]. Der Satan understehet die leypliche gegenwertigkait zu bereden auffdas er alles gut umbstürtze und ferbet sein betrug das er sein gegenwertigkait fürgibt nit in gestalt ains menschens, sonder in gestalt ains brots.

– So nun sollich brott mitt leyplichen augen gesehen wirdt und für Gott geglaubet wirdt, bedarff es leyplicher dienstparkait, seyttemal es unbillichen ist das Got under ain klain hüttlin verschlossen und on vereerung verlassen werde. Das hatt so brachtliche tempel und tempelzierde auffbracht, daher kommen die Ampeln, kertzen, silbern, guldin und von aller hand seydene Meszgewand, Tapeten, Sacramenthauszlin, Tafeln und anders; das hat ursach der Münc1v chen und Pfaffen übermessigen heü-|len geben und das Pfaffen schmieren und ire Sodomitische keüschait eingefürt, den layen das ander tayl des Sacraments genommen, etc.

– In ainer summ zu sagen, nymm disz Sacrament hinweg so hast du des ganzen Bapstumbs gaystlichait, vortayl und grund umbgestossen, welche etwan on zweyfel fallen wirdt, seyttemal sy yetzundt zum grössern tayl bey vilen gefallen ist. Stünde sy auff dem felsen Christo, möchte sy wider alle wetter beston, so ir menschengedicht unsteet und unüberwindlich ist.

– Was ist nun der verstand diser wort: *disz ist mein leyb*? Er ist nit verborgen, dann er nit will das brot verwandeln, sonder mit den worten *disz ist mein leyb* will er sich selbs geben, wie der verkauffer ains ackers in übergebung ain stain, holtz oder halm übergibt, und sagt: 'Sihe, ich übergib dir den acker', und wie besitzung des hauwsz in überantwurtung der schlüssel geben wirdt. Gleycher gestallt übergibt sich uns Christus durchs brot, als ob er sagen wolt: 'Nempt und essen, und haltens nitt für gering, danndas ich euch gib bedeüttet meinen leyb, den ich euch gib so ich das selbig gib so er am Creütz hangen würt, so würt er für euch hangen, ja was ich thu und thun würd, ist ewer'. Dise süsse wort recht erwegen seind ain grosser trost.

– Es ist auch nicht vergeblich, das disz wörtlin 'ist' für das wort 'bedeüttet' genommen wirdt, dann es ist sovil desto häfftiger ge-

redt, als wann ain schwartzer wolcken zeügt und sagt: 'das ist gewisz ain regen', da wirdt der zukünfftig regen vil gewisser angezaygt dann sagte man: 'disz bedeüt ain regen'.

– Diser red gleychen hatt die geschrifft allenthalben. Genesi. 40 [Gen 40,12]: 'drey reben sein drey tag', item [Gen 40,18]: 'drey körb seind drey tag', und im nachgeenden Capitel [Gen 41,26]: 'Die siben gutten äheren seind siben guter jar, die siben guten rinder seind siben jar'. Der exempel gleychen ist alle schrifft vol, so die | Römer in aller geschrifft für ir auszlegung nitt ain exempel C2r geben mögen.

– Auch mögen die Römer nit anzaygen wa Christus wider all erfarung ain zaichen ye gethon hab. Die blinden hat er sehend gemacht, die todten lebendig, die aussetzigen rayn, also das mänigklichen sahe dise geschicht und nitt das man sy glauben müste.

– Aber der Bäpstlich hauff thut unsichtbarliche wunder. Ausz aim grossen buben und erloszen dollen menschen macht er ain hailigen hochgeleerten Apt oder Bischoff. Nitt das man in der erfarung sehe das er hailiger sey dann vor, aber hailiger und weyser wirt er geglaubt. Dergleychen vil wunder thut er. Die zellen erlöszet er ausz dem fegfewer, er verzeyhet etwas von der straff die Gott für die sünd auffgelegt hat (wie er fürgibt), und das thut er umbs gelt, auch von zeytlicher straff der sünden, das doch nit erscheynet dann in kriegen und pestilentzen haben die entledigten vom Bapst kain vortayl vor anderen die nit seind Absolviert worden.

– Darumb aber müssen wir zwischen dem genossenen brot und Christo, den wir durch den glauben nyessen, ain underschayd machen. Dann so ainer nit underschaydet und maint das er nichts nem denn das er mit dem mund nympt, der ist schuldig an desz Herren leyb und blut und ysset und trinckt im das urtayl, seytemal er sich mit essen und trincken sich annympt und fürgibt das er Christum hab von dem er durch unglauben geüssert ist. Ach got, erbarm dich unser, dann diser unser unglaub ist grawsam und erschrockenlich. Die kinder von Israel nach der erlösung von dem gewalt Pharaonis seind mit brot von himel erfettiget worden und seind bald gewichen von dem weg den in Got durch Mosen anzaigte, und machten in ain gossen kalb, bettent es an,

1–2 '*das ist gewisz ain regen*'] '*das ist ain gewisz ain regen*'. 6 *Capitel*] *Capistel.* 18 *hailiger*] *hailig.*

schlachtent im opfer und sagten [Ex 32,4]: *Dasz seind dein göter,*
C2v *Israel, die dich ausz dem land Egypti gefürt haben.* | Wie vil grösser ist nun unser grewel, die wir vom wort Christi unnsers fürers so schnell gewichen sein, welcher sagt: *Wa yemandts sprechen wirdt: 'Hie oder dort ist Christus', so glauben es nicht* [Mt 24,23], wir heben aber brot auff und sagen: 'Das ist unser Gott, der uns mit seym blut erlöszet hatt'.

– Disz ist höchlich zu verwerffen und ist auch den nitt glauben zu geben, die da sagend das der leyb Christi sey im brot wie das fewer sey im eysen, wir wolten dann Christo zuvor nitt glauben, der da sagt: *Wenn sy sprechen: 'Syh Christus ist in der Kamer', so glauben es nitt* [Mt 24,26]. Frommer leeser, das ist das wort Gottes: *Der mensch lebt nitt im brot allain, sonnder in aim yeden wortt das vom mund Gottes auszgeet* [Mt 4,4]. Und der herr sagt nit: 'in disem oder jhenem wort', sonder: 'in aim yedtlichen'. Aber wir verlassen alle wort die Christus an seym letsten Nachtmal geredt hatt, nemen uns diser allain an: *Das ist mein leyb. Und diser Kelch ist das New testament in meinem blut*, etc. Uber welche nun mer so vil bücher geschriben sein, das sy ain person in vil zeyt nit möchte alle erleesen. Unser sünd verschuldet, das wir solliche bücherschreyber haben müssen, die wir den brunnen der lebendigen wasser, Gott den herren verlassen, und uns zu den alten gruben keren [Jer 2,13]. Alle wort Gottes und allain die wort Gottes sollen wir hören. Nichts ist uns frey und in unser wal. Der herr spricht: *Mein schaff hören mein stimm, der frembden stimm hören sy nitt* [Io 10,3–5]. Was darfst du dich nun understeen zu thun oder zu reden von dir selbs so das alles vom Herren verbotten ist. Bistu ain schaff Christi, so würstu die nitt hören die solliche maynung reden, das wort Christi verbeüttet es dir. Was ist deim bruder mitgeholffen, was fürderstu in ob du schon alle Consecrierte hostien gessen hettest und aller Kelch weyn ausztrunckst.

C3r – Woltest du sagen: 'Ich hab ain gebott, das sagt: "das | thun zu meiner gedechtnusz"'. Das reympt sich nit, seyttemal Christus im selbigen Nachtmal genug angezayget hat was wir thun sollen, die der Evangelist Johannes durch fünff Capitel beschreybet, vom dreyzehend bisz auf das achtzehend [Io 15–18]. Hör, hör, Israel, die wort des Herren deines Gottes. Das sprichet der Herr: *Was ir aim ausz disem geringsten nicht thun, das habt ir mir nicht gethon* [Mt 25,45]. Hütten euch vor den falschen leerern, vor den falschen Christen die vil verfüren.

– Vor zeyten haben sy gesagt: 'Ich bin Thome, ich bin Scoti, Hieronymi, Augustini, Frantzisci', etc., yetzund welche komme die sagen: 'Ich bin Christus', doch hinderreden sy iren bruder und vil ausz in seind geyttig, liebhaber ir selbs, verlassen was Gott belangt, underziehen sich nichts wenigers denn das die lieb belangt. *Bey iren früchten erkennen sy*, spricht der Herre [Mt 7,16]. *Aber darinn wirdt yedermann wissen das ir warlich mein Junger sein, wann ir ainannder lieb haben* [Io 13,35]. Warlich jhene rheden das dem volck anmütig ist, geschweygen der waren leer die da sagt das man nyemandt belaidigen, aber gedultig in verfolgung sein sollen, dem bösen nit widersteen, sonder im gutten das böse überwinden, das nit soll widersprochen werden dem der dir dein gutt unbillich abnympt, das die gantz besitzung dem zugeben ist, der die halb von dir begert. Sollicher leer gedencken sy nit, desz Herren predig so er auff dem berg gehabt, underlassen sy, darinn Christus ain Christlich leben anrichtet und alles erkläret das der leng nach im letsten Nachtmal erzelet ist. Dise ding leeret man nit oder leeret sy hinläszlich, und nach menschlicher anzayg, deszhalb on frucht und on gayst, on welchen wir nit mögen der wort Christi erinnert werden. Welcher nit wirdt zugegen sein, so lang wir sein leypliche gegenwertigkait glauben, dann *wa ich nitt hingehe*, spricht er, *so wirdt der tröster nit zu euch kommen* [Io 16,7].| C3v

– Disz haben wir zu dir dem Gotseligen leeser geschriben, und wöllen vom waren essen desz Herren leyb und trincken seines bluts in kurzem, will Got, weyttern bericht geben. Bitt für mich, auff das unser glaub nit gebreche, sonder das wir alsz ware schaff des rechten hirten und nit der frembden stymm hören. Amen.

13 *zugeben*] *zegeben.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Sources

1. *Unpublished sources*

Amsterdam, Municipal Archives (Gemeentearchief), Archief burgemeesters 5029, nr. 72: 'Prothocolle van alle de reysen, te peyne waerde omme bescreven te werden, bij mij Andries Jacopsz. gedaen zedert ick de stede van Amstelredamme gedient heb gehadt, welcke dienst begon den XIIIden Novembris anno XVcXXII (tot den XVIIIden Januarij XVcXXXIX)', two vols.

Cambridge, University Library, Ii.3.8., fols. 99recto–91verso: Latin sermon for Corpus Christi, ca. 1400.

Deventer, Municipal Athenaeum Library, I.32, ff. 25–148: Cornelius Aurelius: 'Vita gloriosi Jheronimi, doctoris ecclesie eximii et zelatoris precipui'.

Geneva, Institut d'Histoire de la Réformation, 'Papiers A.-L. Herminjard'.

Groningen, University Library, HS Add. 125 (correspondence of Daniel Gerdes).

The Hague, Algemeen Rijksarchief (General State Archives), Archief van de Grafelijkheidsrekenkamer, 490–495: Registers van de commissien.

Ibidem, Algemeen Rijksarchief (General State Archives), Archief Hof van Holland, Register van Acten, Dingtalen ende lopende Appoinctementen van Partijen, no. 2930.

Ibidem, Algemeen Rijksarchief (General State Archives), Archief Hof van Holland, Sententies (civiel), no. 497, sentences 155 and 170.

Leiden, University Library, Vulcanius 66,

ff. 1recto–2recto: Cornelius Aurelius, 'Epistola ad Cornelium Hoenium'.

ff. 10recto–40recto: Cornelius Aurelius, 'Apocalipsis et visio mirabilis super miserabili statu matris ecclesie'.

ff. 43recto–45recto: 'Epistola consolitoria Aurelii ad Cornelium Hoenium'.

ff. 45recto–57verso: Cornelius Aurelius, 'Libellus de patientia'.

ff. 57verso–65verso: 'Ad eundem Cornelium Hoenium Jurisconsultum Hagensis Curie celeberrimum Epistola Aurelii exhortatoria'.

Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 10351, fol. 14recto–18verso: Albert. Hardenberg, 'Vita Wesseli Groningensis'.

Ibidem, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 10351, fol. 125recto–131recto: Albert Hardenberg, treatise on 'Cohabitatio clandestina'.

Ibidem, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 10376 (= Collectio Camerariana, 26),

no. 51, fol. 233: Henricus Alting, 'Notitiae historicae de Wilhelmo Gnaphaeo'.
Oxford, Bodleian Library MS 703, ff. 102–183: William Woodford, 'Quaestiones LXXII de sacramento altaris'.

2. *Published sources*

A. *Cornelius Henrici Hoen*

See the introduction to the critical edition, in Appendix 1.

B. *Other authors*

(Names of authors up to 1500 are listed with their first names first.)

Adelman of Liège, *Ad Berengarium epistola*, in R. Heurtevent, *Durand de Troarn* (Paris, 1912), pp. 287–303.
Agricola, Rodolphus, *De inventione dialectica. Lucubrationes*, Alardus Aemstelredamus, ed. (Cologne, 1539; repr. Nieuwkoop, 1967).
Alain of Lille, *De fide catholica contra haereticos sui temporis*. MPL 210, pp. 305–430.
Alfonso of Spina, *Fortalitium fidei in vniuersos Christiane religionis hostes*, Guilelmus Totani, ed. (Lyon, 1525).
Alger of Liège, *De sacramentis corporis et sanguinis Dominici libri tres*. MPL 180, pp. 743–854.
Ambrose, *De sacramentis*. CSEL 73, 13–85.
Amerbachkorrespondenz, Die, II, A. Hartmann, ed., II: *1514–1524* (Basel, 1943); VI, Beat Rudolf Jenny, ed. (Basel, 1967).
Anthonius de Castro, *Impugnatorium contra epistolam M. Wesseli Groningensis ad M. Jacobum Hoeck, de indulgentiis*, M. van Rhijn, ed. (The Hague, 1919).
Augustine, *De consensu euangelistarum*. MPL 34.
———, *Tractatus in Euangelium Ioannis*. CCL 36.
———, *Quaestiones Euangeliorum*. MPL 35, pp. 1323–1332.
———, *Sermones*. MPL 38 and 39.
———, *Quaestionum in Heptateuchum libri septem*. CCSL 33.
Aurelius, Cornelius, *Apocalipsis et visio mirabilis super miserabili statu matris ecclesiae*, in C. Burman, ed., *Hadrianus VI siue analecta*, pp. 259–314.
Beringerius Turonensis, *Rescriptum contra Lanfrannum*, R.B.C. Huygens, ed. CCCM 84 (Turnhout, 1988).
———, *In purgatoria epistola*, in J. de Montclos, *Lanfranc et Bérenger*, pp. 531–538.
Bernardus of Clairvaux, *Sermones* II (*Opera* V), J. Leclercq and H. Rochais, edd. (Rome, 1968).
Biblia latina cum glossa ordinaria (Strasbourg: Adolph Rusch, 1480–1481; repr. in four volumes, Turnhout, 1982).
Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem, Robertus Weber *et alii*, edd., 2 vols. (Stuttgart, [1969]1983).
Biel, Gabriel, *Canonis missae expositio*, Heiko A. Oberman and William J. Cour-

tenay, edd., 4 vols. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte, Mainz; Abteilung für abendländische Religionsgeschichte, Bd. 31–34 (Wiesbaden, 1963–1967).

Blécourt, A. de and E. Meijers, edd., *Memorialen van het Hof (den Raad) van Holland, Zeeland en West-friesland (Memorialen Rosa) vann de secretaris Jan Rosa*, part I–III. Rechtshistorisch instituut, first series, 1 (Haarlem, 1929).

Bloccius, Petrus, *Praecepta formandis puerorum moribus perutilia*, A.M. Coebergh van den Braak, ed. Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia, 6 (Louvain, 1991).

Boethius, *In Isagogen Porphyrii*. CSEL 48.

Brenz, Johannes, *Frühschriften* I, Martin Brecht, Gerhard Schäfer and Frieda Wolf, edd. (Tübingen, 1970).

———, *Underrichtung der zwispaltigen artickel christenlichs glaubens*, in Johannes Brenz, *Frühschriften* I, pp. 55–111.

———, *Syngramma Suevicum*, in Johannes Brenz, *Frühschriften* I, pp. 222–278.

Brunfels, Otto, *Verbum Dei multo magis expedit audire quam Missam, ad episcopum Basiliensem* (Strasbourg: J. Schott, 1523).

———, *Pandectarum libri XIII de tropis, figuris et modis loquendi scripturarum* (Strasbourg: J. Schott, 1528).

Bucer, Martin, *Martin Butzers an ein christlichen Rath und Gemeyn der statt, Weissenburg Summary seiner Predig daselbst gethon*, MBDS I, pp. 69–147.

———, *Abendmahlsgutachten ad Jacobum Otterum*, MBDS III, pp. 409–420.

———, *Grund und Ursach der neüwerungen an dem nachtmal des herren*, MBDS, I, pp. (185)194–278.

———, *Instructio ad Wittembergenses*, in MBDS III, pp. 421–430.

Burman, C., ed., *Hadrianus VI siue analecta historica de Hadriano sexto trajectino, papa romano* (Utrecht, 1727).

Correspondance de Nicolas Clénard, Alphinse Roersch, ed., 3 vols. (Brussels, 1940–1941).

Constitutiones Concilii quarti Lateranensis vna cum Commentariis glossatorum, Antonio García y García, ed., Monumenta iuris canonici, series A: Corpus glossatorum, 2 (Vatican City, 1981).

Cyrillus Alexandrinus, *Explanatio in Lucae Euangelium*. MPG 72, pp. 475–950.

'Dat Avotmael ons Heeren', edited by J. Trapman, NAKG 51 (1970) 149–166.

Disputatio inter catholicum et paterinum haereticum, in Edmundus Martène and Ursinus Durand, edd., *Thesaurus nouus anecdotorum*, 5 vols. (Paris, 1717; repr. New York, 1968), vol. V, pp. 1704–1758.

Documenta Reformatoria, 2 vols. (Kampen, 1960–1962).

Doebner, Richard, ed., *Annalen und Akten der Brüder des gemeinsamen Lebens im Lüchtenhofe zu Hildesheim* (Hannover–Leipzig, 1903).

Dondaine, A., ed., *Un traité néo-manichéen du XIIIe siècle: le 'Liber de duobus principiis', suivi d'un fragment de rituel cathare* (Rome, 1939).

Dorpius, Martinus, *Orationes IV*, J. IJsewijn, ed. (Leipzig, 1986).

Durand of Osca, *Liber antiheresis*, in Kurt-Victor Selge, *Die ersten Waldenser, mit Edition des Liber antiheresis des Durandus von Osca*, 2 vols. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, 37/I and 37/II (Berlin, 1967), vol. II: *Der Liber antiheresis des Durandus von Osca.*

Durand of Troarn, *Liber de corpore et sanguine Christi aduersus Berengarium et eius sectatores*. MPL 149, pp. 1375–1424.

Ébrard of Béthune, *Liber antiheresis*, in Margarinus de La Bigne, *Maxima bibliotheca veterum patrum et antiquorum scriptorum ecclesiasticorum*, 27 vols. (Lyon, 1677), vol. XXIV, pp. 1525–1584.

Engen, John H. van [translator], *Devotio Moderna: Basic Writings* (New York, 1988).

English Wycliffite Sermons I, Anne Hudson, ed. (Oxford, 1983); III, ed. Anne Hudson (Oxford, 1990).

Enzinas, Francisco de, *Mémoires de Francisco de Enzinas. Texte latin inédit avec la traduction française en regard, 1543–1545*, Ch.-Al. Campan, ed., 2 vols. (Brussels–The Hague, 1862).

———, *Historia de statu Belgico deque religione Hispanica*, F. Socas, ed. (Stuttgart–Leipzig, 1991).

Erasmus, Desiderius, *Opera* (Leiden, 1703–1706; repr. Hildesheim, 1961–1962).

———, *Nouum Instrumentum omne* (Basel: Froben, 1516).

———, *In Nouum Testamentum Annotationes* (Basel: Froben, 1519).

———, *In Nouum Testamentum Annotationes* (Basel: Froben, 1522).

———, *In Nouum Testamentum Annotationes* (Basel: Froben, 1527).

———, *In Nouum Testamentum Annotationes* (Basel: Froben, 1535).

———, *Novum Instrumentum*. Faksimile-Nachdruck [der Ausgabe] Basel 1516 mit einer historischen, textkritischen und bibliographischen Einleitung von Heinz Holeczek (Stuttgart–Bad Canstatt, 1986).

———, *Erasmus' Annotations on the New Testament* [I]: *the Gospels*. Facsimile of the final Latin text (1535) with all earlier variants (1516, 1519, 1522, 1527), edited by Anne Reeve, introduction by M.A. Screech, calligraphy by Patricia Payn, 3 vols. (London, 1986–Leiden, 1993).

———, *Epistola ad fratres Inferioris Germaniae*, ASD IX,1, C. Augustijn, ed., pp. (311)328–425.

———, *Adagia*, in ASD II,5.

Ermengaud of Béziers, *Contra hereticos*. MPL 204, pp. 1235–1272.

Everardi, Nicolaas, *Responsa siue consilia* (Louvain: Sassen and Birckmann, 1544).

Fichardus, J., ed., *Virorum qui superiori nostroque seculo, eruditione et doctrina illustres atque memorabiles fuerunt vitae* (Frankfurt, 1536).

Finsler, Georg, ed., *Die Chronik des Bernhard Wyss* (Basel, 1901).

Fredericq, Paul, ed., *Codex documentorum sacratissimarum indulgentiarum Neerlandicarum: verzameling van stukken betreffende de pauselijke aflaten in de Nederlanden (1300–1600)*. Rijks geschiedkundige publicatiën, kleine serie, 21 (The Hague, 1922).

Frith, John, *A christen sentence and true iudgement of the most honourable sacrament of Christes body and bloude declared both by the auctorite of the holy Scriptures and the ancient Doctores*, in Thomas More, *The Complete Works* VII (New Haven–London, 1990), pp. 423–433.

Gabbema, S.A., ed., *Epistolarum ab illustribus et claris viris scriptarum centuriae tres* (Harlingen, 1663).

Gansfort, Wessel, *Opera* (Groningen, 1614; repr. Nieuwkoop, 1966).

[Geldenhouwer, Gerard,] *Collectanea van Gerardus Geldenhauer Noviomagus*, J. Prinsen J.Lz., ed. (Amsterdam, 1901).

Gnapheus, Guilielmus, *Morosophus, de vera ac personata sapientia comoedia non minus festiua quam pia* (Dantzig: Franciscus Rhodius, 1541).

———, *Johannis Pistorii a Worden ob euangelicae doctrinae assertionem apud Hollandos primo omnium exusti, vita […], anno M.D.XXV. conscripta, sed nunc primum a quodam pietatis studioso in lucem edita* (Strasbourg: Wendelin Rihel, 1546; partly reprinted in Fredericq IV, no. 378 [pp. 406–452]).

———, *Joannis Pistorii Woerdenatis ob euangelicae veritatis assertionemm apud Hollandos primo omnium exusti, martyrium*, Jacobus Revius, ed. (Leiden, 1649; 2nd ed., Leiden, 1650).

———, *De eerste Hollandsche martelaer, ofte Historie van het liiden ende de doodt aengedaen Jan de Bakker […] van Woerden […] in 's Gravenhage verbrandt in […] 1525*, Jacob Verwey transl. (Leiden, 1652; 2nd ed., Leiden, 1657).

———, *Een suuerlicke ende seer schone disputacie, welcke gheschiet is in den Haghe in Hollant, tusschen die kettermeesters ende eenen christelijcken priester ghenaemt Jan van Woorden, aldaer gheuanghen ende oock verbrant. Welcke questien al wel ghenoteert gheweest zijn van eenen wel gheleerden man, anno duysent vijfhondert XXV, den vijfthienden dach Septembris* (Antwerp: Frans Fraet, ca. 1552–1554; reprinted in Fredericq IV, no. 379 [pp. 453–496]).

———, *Een troost ende spiegel der siecken ende derghenen die in lijden zijn, wt die Heylighe Scrift by een ghevoecht ende neerstelick gecorrigeert* (Antwerp: Adriaen van Berghen, 1531; Antwerp: Frans Fraet, ca. 1552–1554; BRN I, pp. 151–249).

———, *Tobias ende Lazarus, mit grooter nersticheydt ghecorrigeert, verbetert, ende in drie dialogos oft t'samen sprekinghe vnderscheydelicken ghedeelt, alle krancken, bedroefden ende eenuoldighe menschen seer profijtelick ende troostelick om te lesen* (Emden: Gillis van der Erven, 1557).

———, *Acolastus*, Johannes Bolte, ed. Lateinische Literaturdenkmäler des XV. und XVI. Jahrhunderts, 1 (Berlin, 1891).

———, *Acolastus. Latijnse tekst met Nederlandse vertaling*, P. Minderaa, ed. (Zwolle, 1956).

———, see also under *Literature*, Atkinson, W.E.D.

Guitmundus of Aversa, *De corporis et sanguinis Christi veritate in eucharistia*. MPL 149, pp. 1427–1494.

Hardenberg, Albert, *Vita Wesseli Groningensis*, in Wessel Gansfort, *Opera*, **–***2verso.

———, *Summa doctrinae de coena Domini*, in Daniel Gerdes, *istoria Motuum ecclesiasticorum in ciuitate Bremensi sub medium seculi XVI. ab. 1547–1561, tempore Alberti Hardenbergii suscitatorum* (Groningen–Bremen, 1756), pp. 100–107.

Heimpel, Hermann, ed., *Drei Inquisitions-Verfahren aus dem Jahre 1425: Akten der Prozesse gegen die deutschen Hussiten Johannes Drändorf und Peter Turnau sowie gegen Drändorfs Diener Martin Borchard*. Veröffentlichungen des Max-Planck-Instituts für Geschichte, 24 (Göttingen, 1969).

Herminjard, A.-L., ed., *Correspondance des réformateurs dans les pays de langue française* I: *1512–1526* (Geneva–Paris, 1866).

Hieronymus, *Epistulae*, 3 vols (CSEL 44–46).

Horatius, *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*, Stephanus Borzsák, ed. (Leipzig, 1984).

Innocent III, *De sacra altaris mysterio libri sex*. MPL 217, pp. 763–916.
Ioannes Damascenus, *Explanatio accurata fidei orthodoxae*. MPG 94, pp. 790–1228.
(pseudo-)Jacobo de Capellis, *Summa contra hereticos*, in Dino Bazzocchi, *L'eresia catara: Saggio storico filosofico con in appendice* Disputationes nonnullae aduersus haereticos, *codice inedito de seculo XIII della biblioteca Malatestina di Cesena* (Bologna, 1919–1920).
Joannis Hus, *De sanguine Christi*, Wenzel Flajshans, ed. *Opera Omnia* I/3 (Prague, s.a.).
———, *De sex erroribus*, in Bohumil Ryba, ed., *Betlemské texty* (Prague, 1951), pp. 39–63.
———, *Schriften zur Glaubensreform und Briefe der Jahre 1414–1415*, Walther Schamsula, ed. (Frankfurt, 1969).
Kan, I.B., *Wesseli Groningensis, Rodolphi Agricolae, Erasmi Roterodami vitae ex codice Vindobonensi typis descriptae*, in *Erasmiani Gymnasii programma litterarium* (Rotterdam, 1894).
———, 'Nieuwe levensberichten van Wessel Gansfort en Rudolph Agricola, medegedeeld uit een Weener H.S.', *Groningsche volksalmanak voor het jaar 1899* (Groningen, 1898), pp. 63–83.
Karlstadt, Andreas [Bodenstein von], *Von beiden Gestalten der heiligen Messe. Von Zeichen in gemein, was sie wirken und deuten* (Wittenberg: Nickel Schirlentz, [November–December] 1521).
———, *Karlstadts Schriften aus den Jahren 1523–1525*, Erich Hertz, ed., 2 vols. Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts, 325 (Halle, 1957).
———, *Dialogus oder Gesprächsbüchlein: Von dem greulichen, abgöttischen Missbrauch des hochwürdigsten Sakraments Jesu Christi*, in *Karlstadts Schriften aus den Jahren 1523–1525* II, pp. 5–49.
Krafft, Karl and Wilhelm, edd., *Briefe und Documente aus der Zeit der Reformation im 16. Jahrhundert, nebst Mittheilungen über Kölnische Gelehrte und Studien im 13. Jahrhundert* (Elberfeld, 1875).
Krebs, Mannfred and Hans-Georg Rott, edd., *Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer* VII: *Elsass* I: *Stadt Strassburg, 1522–1532*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte, 26 (Gütersloh, 1959).
Lameere, J., ed., *Recueil des ordonnances des Pays-Bas* II/2 (1520–1529) (Brussels, 1898).
Lanfranc of Bec, *De corpore et sanguine Domini aduersus Berengarium Turonensem liber*. MPL 150, pp. 407–442.
Listrius, Gerardus, *Epistola theologica aduersus Dominicanos Suollenses*, B.J. Spruyt, ed., NAK 71 (1991) 224–244.
Luther, Martin, *Disputatio Heilbergae habita* (1518) in StA I, pp. 186–219.
———, *Ein Sermon von dem Neuen testament, das ist von der heiligen Messe* (1519) in StA I, pp. 288–311.
———, *De captiuitate Babylonica ecclesiae praeludium* (1520) in StA II, pp. 168–259.
———, *Vom Anbeten des Sacraments des heiligen Leichnams Christi*, in WA XI, pp. (417)431–456.
———, *Eyn Brieff an die Christen zu Straspurg wider den Schwermer Geyst*, in WA XV, pp. (380)391–397.

———, *Wider die himmlischen Propheten*, in WA XVIII, pp. 62–125.
———, *Thesen und Erläuterungen zur Heidelberger Disputation und Schrift über die Beichte. Einleitung zum zweiten Galaterkommentar. Gedicht auf Graf Enno II. von Ostfriesland. Drei neugefundene lateinische Drucke aus der St.-Gotthardt-Bibliothek in Brandenburg*, Konrad von Rabenau, ed. (Leipzig, 1987).
Marnix, Philips of, *Oeuvres*, Edgar Quinet, ed., 6 vols. (Brussels, 1857–1860).
Matthaeus, Anthonius, ed., *Fundationes et fata ecclesiarum* (Leiden, 1704).
Matthias von Janov, *Regulae veteris et noui testamenti*, Vlastimil Kybal, ed., 4 books in 5 volumes (Innsbruck–Prague, 1808–1926).
Meijers, E., ed., see under Blécourt, A. de.
Melanchthon, Philippus, *Oratio de vita Rodolphi Agricolae*, CR XI, pp. 438–446.
Micron, Marten, *Apologeticum scriptum* (Emden, 1557).
Moll, W., 'Aanteekeningen van een tijdgenoot, betreffende de opkomende Hervorming en hare verbreiding, inzonderheid in het fraterhuis te Doesburg', *Kerkhistorisch archief* 3 (1862) 108–115.
Moneta of Cremona, *Aduersus Catharos et Valdenses libri quinque*, Thomas Augustinus Ricchinus, ed. (Rome, 1743; repr. Ridgewood, N.J., 1964).
More, Thomas, *A letter of syr Tho. More knyght impugnynge the erronyouse wrytyng of Iohan Fryth agaynst the blessed sacrament of the aultare*, in Thomas More, *The Complete Works* VII (New Haven–London, 1990), pp. 229–258.
Müller, E.F. Karl, ed., *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche* (Leipzig, 1903).
Niewe Testament, Dat, welc is dat leuende woert Gods […] (Delft: Cornelis Heynricsz. Lettersnijder, 1524).
Odo Caeracensis, *In canonem missae*. MPL 160.
Oecolampadius, Johannes, *De genuina verborum Domini expositione liber* (Strasbourg, 1525).
Origenes, *De principiis*. MPG 11.
Pabon, N.J., ed., *De Hofboeken van 's-Gravenhage, 1458–1561* ('s-Gravenhage, 1937).
Petrus Horn, *Vita Geradi Magni*, W.J. Kühler, ed., NAK 6 (1909) 325–370.
Petrus Lombardus, *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*. Editiones Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Clars Aquas (Grottaferrata, 1971–).
Pierre of Poitiers, *Sententiarum libri quinque*. MPL 211, pp. 790–1280.
Ratramnus, *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, J.N. Bakhuizen van den Brink, ed. (Amsterdam–London, 1974).
Rupert of Deutz, MPL 167.
Sartorius, Ioannes, *Grammatica* (Antwerp: M. Hillenius, 1533).
———, *Centuria syntaxeon in Decades distincta […]* (Antwerp: Hendr. Peetersen van Middelburch, 1539).
Schilling, Heinz, ed., *Die Kirchenratsprotokolle der Reformierten Gemeinde Emden, 1557–1620*, 2 vols. Städteforschung C/3/1–C/3/2 (Vienna, 1989–1992).
Scultetus, Abraham, *Annalium euangelii passim per Europam decimo quinto salutis partae seculo renouati decas prima, ab anno M.D.XVI. ad annum M.D.XXVI.* (Heidelberg, 1618).
Sehling, Emil, ed., *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts* VII/ii/1 (Tübingen, 1963).

Selections from English Wycliffite Writings, Anne Hudson, ed. (Cambridge, 1978).
Smend, Julius, ed., *Die evangelischen deutschen Messen bis zu Luthers Deutscher Messe* (Göttingen, 1896).
Staehelin, Ernst, ed., *Briefe und Akten zum Leben Oekolampads*, 2 vols. Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte, 10, 19 (Leipzig, 1927–1934).
Stephanus Augustinensis, *De sacramento altaris*. MPL 172.
Summa der godliker scrifturen (1523), see under Toorenenbergen, J.J. van, ed.
Tertullianus, *De pudicitia*. CSEL 20.
Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologica*, in *S. Thomae Aquinatis Doctoris Angelici Opera Omnia. Iussu impensaque Leonis XIII, p.m. edita* (Vatican City, 1882–), vols. IV–XII.
Thomas Netter of Walden, *Doctrinale antiquitatum fidei catholicae ecclesiae*, B. Blanciotti, ed. (Venice, 1757–1759; repr. Fairnborough, 1967).
Toorenenbergen, J.J. van, ed., *Het oudste Nederlandsche verboden boek, 1523. Oeconomica Christiana. Summa der godliker scrifturen* (Leiden, 1882).
Tschackert, Paul, *Urkundenbuch zur Reformationsgeschichte des Herzogthums Preussen*, 3 vols. Publicationen aus den K. Preussischen Staatsrachiven, 43–45 (Leipzig, 1890).
Valla, Lorenzo (Laurentius), *Opera Omnia* I (Torino, 1962).
———, *Collatio Novi Testamenti*, Alessandro Perosa, ed. (Florence, 1970).
Wakefield, Walter L. and Austin P. Evans, *Heresies of the High Middle Ages* (New York–London, 1969).
Weiler, A.G., ed., *Necrologie, kroniek en cartularium c.a. van het fraterhuis te Doesburg (1432–1559)*. Kerkhistorische bijdragen, 4 (Leiden, 1974).
Westphal, Joachim, *Collectanea sententiarum diui Aurelii Augustini de coena Domini* (Regensburg, 1555).
Wils, Jos., ed., *Matricule de l'université de Louvain* II (Brussels, 1941).
Wittmer, Ch. and J.Ch. Meyer, edd., *Le livre de bourgeoisie de la ville de Strasbourg, 1440–1530* I–III (Strasbourg, 1948–1961).
Wyclif, John, *Opera minora*, Johann Loserth, ed. (London, 1913).
———, *Tractatus de apostasia*, Michael Henry Dziewicki, ed. (London, 1889).
———, *Trialogus cum supplemento Trialogi*, Gotthard Lechler, ed. (Oxford, 1869).
———, *Io[annis] VViclefi […] dialogorum libri quattuor*, Otto Brunfels, ed. (Worms: Schöffer, 1525).
———, *Expositio textus Matthei XXIV*, in *Opera minora*.
———, *Responsiones ad XLIV conclusiones*, in *Opera minora*, pp. 201–257.
———, *De eucharistia tractatus maior. Accedit tractatus de eucharistia et poenitentia siue de confessione*, Johann Loserth, ed. (London, 1892).
———, *Wycklyffes Wycket, which he made in Kyng Rychards days the second in the yere of our lorde God a. M.LLL.XLV* (Norenburch [= London?], 1546).
Zwingli, Ulrich, *Ad Iohannis Bugenhagii Pomerani epistolam responsio*, in Z IV, pp. (546)558–576.
———, *De vera et falsa religione commentarius*, in Z III, pp. (590)628–912.
———, *Ad Mattheum Alberum de coena dominica epistola*, in Z III, pp. (322)335–354.
———, *Ad Theobaldi Billicani et Urbani Rhegii epistolas responsio*, in Z IV, pp. (880)893–941.

———, *Die erste kurtze antwurt über Eggen siben schlussreden, am XXI tags Mey, 1526*, in Z V, pp. 171–195.
———, *Eyn klare vnderrichtung vom Nachtmal Christi*, in Z IV, pp. 773–862.
———, *De conuitiis Eckii epistola*, in Z VI/iii, pp. 231–291.

Literature

Acquoy, J.G.R., 'Levensbericht van Willem Moll', *Studien en bijdragen op 't gebied der historische theologie* 4 (1880) 476–540.
———, 'Mislukte pogingen der Nederlandsche Gereformeerde Kerken, om hare geschiedenis te doen beschrijven', in *Geschiedkundige opstellen aangeboden aan Robert Fruin* (The Hague, 1894), pp. 229–257.
Akkerman, F. and C.G. Santing, 'Rudolf Agricola en de Aduarder academie', *Groningse Volksalmanak* 1987, pp. 6–28.
———, and G. Huisman and A.J. Vanderjagt, edd., *Wessel Gansfort and Northern Humanism*. Brill's Studies in Intellectual History, 40 (Leiden, 1993).
Alix, Pierre, 'Historia transsubstantiationis', in Pierre Alix, ed., *Determinatio Fr. Joannis Parisiensis de modo existendi corpus Christi in sacramento altaris* (London, 1686).
Allen, P.S., *The Age of Erasmus* (Oxford, 1914).
Alverny, Marie-Thérèse d', 'Introduction', in Alain de Lille, *Textes inédits*. Études de philosophie médiévale, 52 (Paris, 1965), pp. 156–162.
Amira, Karl von, 'Der Stab in der germanischen Rechtssymbolik', *Abhandlungen der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse* 25 (1909) 1–180.
Apeldoorn, L.J. van, *Nicolaes Everaerts (1462–1532) en het recht van zijn tijd* (Amsterdam, 1939).
Armstrong, A.H., see under Liebeschütz, H.
Arroyo, Ciriaco Moron, see under Gilly, Carlos.
Aston, Margaret, 'Lollardy and Literacy', in Aston, *Lollards and Reformers: Images and Literacy in Late Medieval religion* (London–Ronceverte, 1984), pp. 193–217.
Atkinson, W.E.D., *Acolastus: A Latin Play of the Sixteenth Century by Gulielmus Gnapheus. Latin text with a Critical Introduction and an English Translation* (London, Ontario, 1964).
Augustijn, C., 'Das Bild der Reformation bei Daniel Gerdes und Johann Lorenz von Mosheim', NAK 64 (1984) 78–90.
———, '*Allein das heilig Evangelium*: Het mandaat van het Reichsregiment 6 maart 1523', NAK 48 (1967–1968) 150–165.
———, 'Gerard Geldenhouwer und die religiöse Toleranz', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 69 (1978) 132–156.
———, 'Wessel Gansfort's Rise to Celebrity', in F. Akkerman, G. Huisman and A.J. Vanderjagt, edd., *Wessel Gansfort and Northern Humanism*, pp. 3–21.
———, *Erasmus. His Life, Works, and Influence* (Toronto, 1991).
———, 'Godsdienst in de zestiende eeuw', in *Ketters en papen onder Filips II: het godsdienstig leven in de tweede helft van de zestiende eeuw* (The Hague, 1986), pp. 26–40.

———, 'Anabaptisme in de Nederlanden', *Doopsgezinde bijdragen* 12–13 (1987) 13–28.
———, see also under Lindeboom, J.
Babucke, H., *Wilhelm Gnapheus, ein Lehrer aus dem Reformationszeitalter* (Emden, 1875).
Backus, Irena, *The Disputations of Baden, 1526, and Berne, 1528: Neutralizing the Early Church*. Studies in Reformed Theology and History, I-1 (Princeton, 1993).
Bakhuizen van de Brink, J.N., 'Hoen', RGG, 3rd ed., vol. II, p. 411.
Bakhuizen van den Brink, R.C., 'Gnapheus' verhaal van het proces van Jan de Backer', in *Studiën en schetsen over vaderlandsche geschiedenis en letteren* V (The Hague, 1913), pp. 291–308.
Balberghe, Émile van and Jean-François Gilmont, 'Les théologiens et la "Vauderie" au XVe siècle', in Pierre Cockshaw, Monique-Cécile Garand and Pierre Jodogne, edd. *Miscellanea codicologica F. Masai dicata*, 2 vols. (Gand, 1979), II, pp. 393–411.
Barbosa, Augustinus and Otto Tabor, *Thesaurus locorum communium iurisprudentiae* (6th ed.; Cologne, 1737).
Barge, Hermann, 'Zur Chronologie und Drucklegung der Abendmahlsschriften Karlstadts', *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekwesen* 21 (1904) 323–331.
Bartos, F.M., 'Puer Bohemus: Dva projevy husitské propagandy', *Vestnik královske Ceské spolecnosti nauk* 1923 (Prague, 1924), pp. 1–58.
———, 'Picards et "Pikarti"', *Bulletin [de la] société de l'histoire du protestantisme français* 80 (1931) 465–486 and 81 (1932) 8–28.
———, 'Husitika a bohemika nekolika knihoven nemeckych a svycarskych', *Vestnik královske Ceské spolecnosti nauk* 1931 (Prague, 1932).
———, 'Manifesta mesta Prahy z doby husitské', *Sbornik prispevku k dejinám hlavniho mesta Prahy* 7 (1933) 253–309 and 473–474.
———, *The Hussite Revolution, 1424–1437* (Boulder–New York, 1986).
Baum, J.W., *Capito und Butzer* (Elberfeld, 1860; repr. Nieuwkoop, 1967).
Bax, W., *Het protestantisme in het bisdom Luik en vooral te Maastricht*, 2 vols. (The Hague, 1937–1941).
Beek, M.A., see under Kooiman, W.J.
Beeman, F.E. "Poisonous Honey or Pure Manna: the Eucharist and the Word in the 'Beehive' of Marnix of Saint Aldergonde." *Church History*, Vol. 16 No.4 (December 1992), pp. 382–393.
Bentley, Jerry H., *Humanists and Holy Writ: New Testament Scholarship in the Renaissance* (Princeton, 1983).
Benzing, Jozef, 'Peter Schöffer d.J. zu Worms und seine Drucke (1518–1529)', *Der Wormsgau* 5 (1961–1962) 108–118.
———, *Die Buchdrucker des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts im deutschen Sprachgebiet* (2nd ed., Wiesbaden, 1982).
———, *Bibliographie strasbourgeoise: Bibliographie des ouvrages imprimés à Strasbourg au XVIe siècle*. Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana, 50 (Baden-Baden, 1981).
Bergen, Ed. van, *Uit de geschiedenis van Naaldwijk* (s.l., 1924).
Betts, R.R., 'English and Czech Influences on the Hussite Movement', in Betts, *Essays in Czech History* (London, 1969), pp. 132–159.

Beuzart, Paul, *Les hérésies pendant le Moyen Age et la Réforme jusqu'en la mort de Philippe II, 1598, dans la région de Douai, d'Arras et au pays d l'Alleu* (Le Puy, 1912).
Bietenholz, Peter G., *Contemporaries of Erasmus: A Biographical Register of the Renaissance and the Reformation*, 3 vols. (Toronto etc., 1985–1987).
Bijl, S.W., *Erasmus in het Nederlands tot 1617*. Bibliotheca Bibliographica Neerlandica, 10 (Nieuwkoop, 1978).
Biller, Peter and Anne Hudson, edd., *Literacy and Heresy, 1000–1530*. Cambridge studies in Medieval Literature, 23 (Cambridge, 1994).
Blaas, P.B.M., 'The Touchiness of a Small Nation with a Great Past: The Approach of Fruin and Blok to the Writing of the History of the Netherlands', in Duke and Tamse, edd, *Clio's Mirror: Historiography in Britain and the Netherlands*, pp. 133–161.
Blaise, Albert, *Le vocabulaire latin des principaux thèmes liturgiques* (Turnhout, s.a.).
Blom, J.C.H. and C.J. Misset, '"Een onvervalschte Nederlandsche geest": enkele historiografische kanttekeningen bij het concept van een nationaalgereformeerde richting', in E.K. Grootes and J. den Haan, edd., *Geschiedenis, godsdienst, letterkunde: opstellen aangeboden aan dr. S.B.J. Zilverberg* (Roden, 1989), pp. 221–232.
Boockmann, Hartmut, 'Der Streit um das Wilsnacker Blut: Zur Situation des deutschen Klerus in der Mitte des 15. Jahrhunderts', *Zeitschrift für historische Forschung* 9 (1982) 385–408.
Boom, H. ten, *De Reformatie in Rotterdam, 1530–1585* (s.l., 1987).
———, *et alii*, edd., *Utrechters entre-deux: Stad en Sticht in de eeuw van de Reformatie* (Delft, 1992).
Borst, Arno, *Die Katharer*. Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 12 (Stuttgart, 1953; repr. Freiburg, 1991).
Boswell, J., *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality* (Chicago, 1980).
Bot, P.N.M., *Humanisme en onderwijs in Nederland* (Utrecht–Antwerp, 1955).
Boxhorn, Marcus Zuerius van, *Nederlantsche historie. Eerste boeck, behelsende de eerste veranderingen in de godsdienst ende leere, neffen de harde vervolgingen daer over ontstaen in de Nederlanden, voor ende tot de tijden van keizer Karel de Viifde* (Leiden, 1644).
Brandt, Geraerdt, *Historie der Reformatie en andre kerkelyke geschiedenissen in en ontrent de Nederlanden*, 4 vols. (Amsterdam, 1671–1704).
Brecht, Martin, *Martin Luther* I: *Sein Weg zur Reformation, 1483–1521* (Stuttgart, 1986).
———, 'Matthäus Albers Theologie', *Blätter für die Württembergische Kirchengeschichte* 62 (1962) 63–97.
Browe, Peter, *Die eucharistischen Wunder des Mittelalters*. Breslauer Studien zur historischen Theologie, Neue Folge, 4 (Breslau, 1938).
Brown, Andrew J., 'The Date and Purpose of Erasmus' Latin Translation of the New Testament', *Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society* 8 (1984) 351–380.
Bruin, C.C. de, *De Statenbijbel en zijn voorgangers. Nederlandse bijbelvertalingen vanaf de Reformatie tot 1637*, F.G.M. Broeyer, ed. (Haarlem–Brussel, 1993).
———, 'Hinne Rode', in C. Dekker, *et alii*, edd., *Het Sticht van binnen en van buijtenen: bundel opstellen over de geschiedenis van de provincie Utrecht, aangeboden aan dr. M.P. van Buijtenen bij diens zeventigste verjaardag* (Utrecht, 1981), pp. 191–208.

———, 'Beschouwingen rondom het Leuvense ketterproces van 1543', *Rondom het Woord* 9 (1967) 249–259.
Brundage, James A., *Law, Sex and Christian Society in Medieval Europe* (Chicago–London, 1987).
Bubenheimer, Ulrich, '*Scandalum et ius divinum*: Theologische und rechtstheologische Probleme der reformatorischen Innovationen in Wittenberg 1521/22', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte* 90 (1973) 263–342.
Buck, August, see under IJsewijn, J.
Bundschuh, Benno von. "Die Auseinandersetzung um das Abendmahl: der 'Zwinglianismus'" in his *Das Wormser Religionsgespräch von 1557*. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1988, pp. 108–138.
Burke, Peter, 'The Politics of Reformation History: Burnet and Brandt', in Duke and Tamse, edd., *Clio's Mirror: Historiography in Britain and the Netherlands*, pp. 73–85.
Buyken, Thea, see under Planitz, Hanz.
Catalogus van de Remonstrantsch-Gereformeerde Gemeente te Rotterdam (The Hague, 1893).
Catto, J.I., *William Woodford O.F.M. (ca. 1330–ca. 1397)* (unpublished D. Phil. thesis, Oxford, 1969; Bodley: Ms. D. Phil. d. 4877).
———, 'John Wyclif and the Cult of the Eucharist', in Katherine Walsh and Diana Wood, edd., *The Bible in the Medieval World: Essays in Memory of Beryl Smalley*. Studies in Church History; Subsidia, 4 (Oxford, 1985), pp. 269–286.
Cauchie, A., 'Nicole Serrurier, hérétique du XVe siècle', *Annalectes pour server à l'histoire ecclésiastique de la Belgique* 24 (1893) 241–336.
Chadwick, Henry, '*Ego Berengarius*', *Journal of Theological Studies*, new series, 40 (1989) 414–445.
———, 'Symbol and Reality: Berengar and the Appeal to the Fathers', in Peter Ganz, R.B.C. Huygens and Friedrich Niewöhner, edd., *Auctoritas und Ratio*, pp. 26–45.
Chénon, Emile, 'Recherches historiques sur quelques rites nuptiaux', *Nouvelle revue historique de droit français et étranger* 36 (1912) 573–660.
Chrisman, Miriam Usher, 'Brunfels, Otto', in Bietenholz, *Contemporaries of Erasmus* I, pp. 206–207.
———, *Bibliography of Strasbourg Imprints, 1480–1559* (New Haven–London, 1982).
Claesson, Gösta, *Index Tertullianeus* (Paris, 1974).
Clanchy, M.T., *From Memory to Written Record: England, 1066–1307* (London, 1979).
Clemen, Otto, 'Hinne Rode in Wittenberg, Basel, Zürich und die frühesten Ausgaben Wesselscher Schriften', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 18 (1898) 346–372.
Clutton, George, 'Simon du Bois of Paris and Alençon', *Gutenberg-Jahrbuch* 1937, pp. 124–130.
Coing, Helmut, see under Troje, Hans Erich.
Cosin, John, *Historia transsubstantiationis papalis* (London, 1675).
Courtenay, William J., *Schools and Scholars in Fourteenth Century England* (Princeton, 1987).

Dain, A., *Les manuscrits* (3d ed.; Paris, 1975).
Dankbaar, W.F., *Martin Bucers Beziehungen zu den Niederlanden*. Kerkhistorische studiën, 9 (The Hague, 1961).
Decavele, Johan, 'Vroege reformatorische bedrijvigheid in de grote Nederlandse steden: Claes van der Elst te Brussel, Antwerp, Amsterdam en Leiden (1524–1528)', NAK 70 (1990) 13–29.
Deemter, R. van, 'De Avondmaalsbrief van Cornelis Hoen (1525)', *Gereformeerd Theologisch Tijdschrift* 44 (1943) 161–171.
Dekker, Alfred M.M., *Janus Secundus (1511–1536): De tekstoverlevering van het tijdens zijn leven gepubliceerde werk. Joannes Secundus: Textual transmission of the works published during his lifetime*. Bibliotheca Humanistica et Reformatorica, 38 (Nieuwkoop, 1986).
Dekkers, René, *Het Humanisme en de Rechtswetenschap in de Nederlanden* (Antwerp, 1938).
Delprat, G.H.M., *Verhandeling over de broederschap van Geert Grote en over de invloed der Fraterhuizen* (2nd. ed., Arnhem, 1856).
Dermout, I.J., see under Ypey, A.
Derville, Alain, 'L'alphabétisation du peuple à la fin du Moyen Age', *Revue du Nord* 66 (1984) 761–775.
Desplanque, A., 'Troubles de la châtellerie de Cassel, sous Philippe le Bon, 1427–1431', *Annales du comité flamand en France* 8 (1864–1865) 218–281.
Dewitte, A., 'Chronologie van de Reformatie te Brugge en in het Brugse Vrije (1485–1593)', in Dirk van der Bauwhede and Marc Goetinck, edd., *Brugge in de Geuzentijd: Bijdragen tot de geschiedenis van de Hervorming te Brugge en in het Brugse Vrije tijdens de zestiende eeuw* (Bruges, 1982), pp. 34–44.
Dieckhoff, A., *Die evangelische Abendmahlslehre im Reformationszeitalter* I (Göttingen, 1854).
Dis, Leendert Meeuwis van, *Reformatorische rederijkersspelen uit de eerste helft van de zestiende eeuw* (Haarlem, 1937).
Doedes, J.I., 'De buitengewone lotgevallen van het bericht, door Henricus Antonides Nerdenus aangaande het begin der Hervorming in Nederland gegeven, in zijne *Praefatio* voor zijn *Systema theologicum* (1611)', *Godgeleerde bijdragen* 43 (1869) 289–304.
———, 'Een tweede exemplaar van het *Systema theologicum* van Henricus Antonides', *Bibliographische adversaria* 1 (1873–1874) 77–79.
Doornkaat Koolman, J.J. ten, 'Joachim Kükenbieter (Nossiophagus), ein lutherischer Eiferer des Reformationszeitalters', NAK 44 (1961) 157–176.
Drossaers, S.W.A., see under Sernee, J.M.
Dufour, Alain, 'Das Religionsgespräch von Poissy: Hoffnungen der Reformierten und der Moyenneurs', in G. Miller, ed., *Die Religionsgespräche der Reformationszeit*. Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte, 191 (Gütersloh, 1980), pp. 117–126.
Duijn, van C. "Martin Bucer Over Het Helig Avondmaal." *Gereformeerd Weekblaad* no. 92, November (1991): 516–530.
Duke, A.C. and C.A. Tamse, edd., *Clio's Mirror: Historiography in Britain and the Netherlands*. Britain and the Netherlands, 8 (Zutphen, 1985).
Échard, Jacques, see under Quétif, Jacques.

Eeghen, I.H. van, 'De "Officina Corveriana", de eerste internationale uitgever in Amsterdam' *Jaarboek Amstelrodamum* 78 (1986) 54–75.
Eekhof, A., 'Zwingli in Holland', *Zwingliana* 3 (1918–1919) 371–384.
———, 'Hoen, Cornelis', in NNBW VI (Leiden, 1924), pp. 787–788.
Eells, Hastings, 'The Genesis of Martin Bucer's Doctrine of the Lord's Supper', *Princeton Theological Review* 24 (1926) 225–251.
Engelsma, David Jack. "Martin Bucer's 'calvinistic' doctrine of the Lord's Supper" *Protestant Reformed Theological Journal* 22 (November 1988): 3–29.
Engen, John H. van, *Rupert of Deutz*. Publications of the UCLA Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 18 (Berkeley, 1983).
———, 'Observations on "De consecratione"', in Stephan Kuttner and Kenneth Pennington, edd., *Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress of Medieval Canon Law*. Monumenta iuris canonici, series C: Subsidia, 7 (Vatican City, 1985), pp. 309–320.
Esposito, Mario, 'Une secte d'hérétiques à Medina del Campo en 1459, d'après le *Fortalicium fidei* d'Alphonse de Spina', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 32 (1936) 350–360.
———, 'Notes sur le *Fortalicium fidei* d'Alphonse de Spina', *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 43 (1948) 514–536.
Eveson, Paul, ed., *Union and Communion, 1529–1979: Papers read at Westminster Conference, 1979*. London: Westminster Conference, 1979.
Faber, S., see under Werkgroep Grote Raad.
Farmer, David Hugh, *The Oxford Dictionary of Saints* (2nd ed.; Oxford–New York, 1987).
Feenstra, R., '*Nemo auditur suam turpitudinem allegans*', in J.E. Spruit and M. van de Vrugt, edd., *Brocardica in honorem G.C.C.J. van den Bergh* (Deventer, 1987), pp. 31–36.
Feith, W.G., see under Sernee, J.M.
Féret, P., *La faculté de théologie de Paris et ses docteurs les plus célèbres. Moyen Age* IV (Paris, 1897).
Ferguson, George, *Signs and Symbols in Christian Art* (London, 1972).
Ferrari, Mirella, 'Per una storia delle bibliotece francescane a Milano nel Medioevo e nell'Umanesimo', *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum* 72 (1979) 429–464.
Fruin, Robert, 'De samensteller van de zogenaamde Divisie-kroniek' (1888), in Fruin, *Verspreide geschriften* VII (The Hague, 1903), pp. 66–72.
Furcha, Edward J. ed., *Huldrych Zwingli, 1484–1531: a legacy of radical reform*. Montreal: McGill University Press, 1985.
Ganz, Peter, R.B.C. Huygens and Friedrich Niewöhner, edd., *Auctoritas und Ratio: Studien zu Berengar von Tours*. Wolfenbütteler Mittelalter Studien, 2 (Wiesbaden, 1990).
Geest, T.J., 'Gulielmus Gnaphaeus (humanist-hervormer-paedagoog)', *Bijdragen voor vaderlandsche geschiedenis en oudheidkunde* VI-4 (1926) 77–96.
Gentry, Francis G., see under Wailes, Stephen L.
Gerdes, Daniel, *Miscellanea Groningana* III/1 (Groningen, 1740).
———, *Introductio in historiam Euangelii passim per Europam renouati doctrinaeque reformatae* I (Groningen, 1744).

Idem, *Historia motuum ecclesiasticorum in civitate Bremensi sub medium secula XVI.* ab A. 1547–1561, tempore Alberti Hardenbergi suscitatorum (Groningen–Bremen, 1756).

———, *Florilegium historico-criticum librorum rariorum* (Groningen and Bremen, 1763).

Gerrish, B.A. "Discerning the Body: Sign and Reality in Luther's Controversy with the Swiss." *The Journal of Religion* Vol. 68 No.3 (July 1988) pp. 377–395.

Ghellinck, Joseph de, 'Eucharistie au XIIe siècle en occident', *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique* V (Paris, 1924), pp. 1239–1243.

Gieseler, Johann Carl Ludwig, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* III/1 (Bonn, 1840).

Gilly, Carlos, 'Una obra desconocida de Nebrija contra Erasmo y Reuchlin', in Manuel Revuelta and Ciriaco Moron Arroyo, edd., *El Erasmismo en España: ponencias del coloquio celebrado en la Bibliotheca de Menendez Pelayo del 10 al 14 de Junio de 1985* (Santander, 1986), pp. 195–218.

Gilmont, Jean-François, see under Balberghe, Émile van.

Goeters, J.F. Gerhard, *Ludwig Hätzer [ca. 1500–1529], Spiritualist und Antitrinitarier: Eine Randfigur der frühen Täuferbewegung.* Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte, 25 (Gütersloh, 1957).

Götze, Alfred, *Die hochdeutschen Drucker der Reformationszeit* (2nd ed., Berlin, 1963).

Goll, Jaroslav, *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Böhmischen Brüder*, 2 vols. (Prague, 1878–1882).

Gonnet, Jean and Amedeo Molnár, *Les Vaudois au Moyen Age* (Torino, 1978).

Gouw, J.L. van der, 'De Librye van den Hove van Holland', *Het Boek* 29 (1948) 117–130.

Grafton, Anthony, *Josephus Scaliger: A Study in the History of Classical Scholarship*, I: *Textual Criticism and Exegesis* (Oxford, 1983).

de Greef, W. and M. van Campen, ed., *Reformatie in Meervoud*. Kampen: DeGroot Gourdriaan, 1991.

Grosheide, G., *Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis der Anabaptisten in Amsterdam* (Hilversum, 1938).

Grotius, Hugo, Der *Heeren Staten van Hollandt ende West-Vrieslandt godts-dienstigheyt … verdedicht* (The Hague, 1613).

———, *Verantwoordingh van de wettelijcke regieringh van Hollandt ende West-Vrieslandt* ([Hoorn,] 1622).

Idem, Ordinum Hollandiae ac Westfrisiae Pietas (1613). Critical Edition with English Translation and Commentary by Edwin Rabbie. SHCT 66 (Leiden, 1995).

Grundmann, Herbert, *Ketzergeschichte des Mittelalters*. Die Kirche in ihrer Geschichte II/G/1 (3rd ed.; Göttingen, 1978).

———, *Bibliographie zur Ketzergeschichte des Mittelalters (1900–1966)*. Sussidi eruditi, 20 (Rome, 1967).

———, *Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, 3 vols. Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica, 25/1–25/3 (Stuttgart, 1976–1978).

———, 'Litteratus-illitteratus: Der Wandel einer Bildungsnorm vom Altertum zum Mittelalter', in Grundmann, *Ausgewählte Aufsätze* III; *Bildung und Sprache*, pp. 1–66.

Gunst, J.W., *Johannes Pistorius Woerdensis* (Hilversum, 1925).
Haar, H.W. ter, *Jacobus Trigland* (The Hague, 1891).
Häring, Nikolaus M., 'Alain of Lille's *De fide catholica* or *Contra haereticos*', *Analecta cisterciensia* 32 (1976) 216–237.
Haga, A., 'Nieuws over Simon Corver', *Het Boek* 37 (1965–1966) 209–211.
Haitsma Mulier, E.O.G., and G.A.C. van der Lem, edd., *Repertorium van geschiedschrijvers in Nederland, 1500–1800*. Bibliografische reeks van het Nederlands Historisch Genootschap, 7 (The Hague, 1990).
Halm, K., and W. Meyer, edd., *Catalogus codicum latinorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis* II/1. Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae Monacensis IV/1 (Munich, 1874; repr. Wiesbaden, 1968).
Hardt, Hermann von der, *Antiqua literarum monumenta, autographa Lutheri aliorumque celebrium virorum, ab A. 1517 vsque ad A. 1546* III: *[Tomus] Autographorum Lutheri et coaetaneorum* (Helmstadt, 1623).
Harvey, Margaret, 'The Diffusion of the *Doctrinale* of Thomas Netter in the Fifteenth and Sixteenth Centuries', in Lesley Smith and Benedicta Ward, edd., *Intellectual Life in the Middle Ages: Essays presented to Margaret Gibson* (London, 1992), pp. 281–294.
Hausammann, Susi, 'Die Textgrundlage von Zwingli's *Fidei expositio*', *Zwingliana* 13 (1972) 463–472.
Hazlett, Ian, *The Development of Martin Bucer's Thinking on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in Its Historical and Theological Context* (Münster, 1975).
Heymann, Frederick G., *John Zizka and the Hussite Revolution* (Princeton, 1955).
Higman, Francis, 'Dates-clé de la Réforme française: la Sommaire de Guillaume Farel et la Somme de l'escripture saincte', *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 38 (1976) 237–247.
Hilgenfeld, Hartmut, *Mittelalterlich-traditionelle Elemente in Luthers Abendmahlsschriften*. Studien zur Dogmengeschichte und systematischen Theologie, 29 (Zürich, 1971).
Hoek, C., 'Register van de Heilige Geest te Naaldwijk', *Jaarboek Ons voor geslacht* 1961, pp. 9–59.
———, 'Repertorium op de lenen van Honingen', *Ons voorgeslacht* 17 (1962) 33–105.
Hof, J., 'Geding tussen de abdij van Egmond en de magistraat van Alkmaar over het tiendrecht (1513–1531)', *Alkmaars jaarboekje* 6 (1970) 61–66.
Hofstede de Groot, C.P., *Honderd jaren uit de geschiedenis der Hervorming in de Nederlanden, 1518–1619* (Leiden, s.a. [1883]).
Hofstede de Groot, P., 'Beschouwing van den gang, dien de christelijke godgeleerdheid dus verre in Nederland heeft gehouden', *Nederlandsch archief voor kerkelijke geschiedenis* 2 (1842) 121–190.
Hollander, A.A. den, De Nederlandse Bijbelvertalingen, 1522–1545 / Dutch Translation of the Bible, 1522–1545. Bibleiotheca Bibliographica Neerlandica, 33 (Nieuwkoop, 1997).
Hooft, C.P., *Memoriën en adviezen* II, H.A. Enno van Gelder, ed. Werken uitgegeven door het Historisch Genootschap te Utrecht, III-48 (Utrecht, 1925).
Hoop Scheffer, J.G. de, 'De studie der vaderlandsche kerkhistorie', *De Gids* 29 (1865) 201–213.

[Hoop Scheffer, J.G. de,] 'Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis der Hervorming in de Nederlanden. Hendrik Antonisz. van der Linden', *De Navorscher* 17 (1867) 353–360.

———, *Geschiedenis der kerkhervorming in Nederland van haar ontstaan tot 1531* (Amsterdam, 1873).

———, *Geschichte der Reformation in den Niederlanden, von ihrem Beginn bis zum Jahre 1531. Deutsche Originalausgabe, herausgegeben von Dr. P. Gerlach, mit einem Vorwort von Dr. F. Nippold* (Leipzig, 1886).

Hospinianus, Rudolphus, *Historia sacramentaria, hoc est libri quinque de coena Dominicae prima institutione eiusque vero vsu et abusu* (Zurich, 1598).

Hoyer, Siegfried, 'Jan Hus und der Hussitismus in den Flugschriften des ersten Jahrzehnts der Reformation', in Hans-Joachim Köhler, ed., *Flugschriften als Massenmedium der Reformationszeit: Beiträge zum Tübinger Symposion 1980*. Spätmittelalter und Frühe Neuzeit, 13 (Stuttgart, 1981), pp. 291–307.

Hudson, Anne and Michael Wilks, edd., *From Ockham to Wyclif*. Studies in Church History; Subsidia, 5 (Oxford, 1987).

———, *The Premature Reformation: Wycliffite Texts and Lollard History* (Oxford, 1988).

———, '"No Newe Thyng": The Printing of Medieval Texts in the Early Reformation Period', in Anne Hudson, *Lollards and their books* (London–Ronceverte, 1985), pp. 227–248.

———, see also under Biller, Peter.

Huguet, Edmond, *Dictionnaire de la langue française du seizième siècle*, 7 vols. (Paris, 1925–1967; repr. Geneva, 1989).

Huisman, G., see under Akkerman, F.

Huizinga, J., *Verzamelde Werken*, 9 vols. (Haarlem, 1948–1953).

———, *Geschiedenis der [Groningse] universiteit gedurende de derde eeuw van haar bestaan, 1814–1914* (1914), in Huizinga, *Verzamelde Werken* VIII (Haarlem, 1951), pp. 36–339.

———, *Herfsttij der middeleeuwen: studie over levens- en gedachtenvormen der veertiende en vijftiende eeuw in Frankrijk en de Nederlanden* (1919), in Huizinga, *Verzamelde Werken* III (Haarlem, 1949), pp. 3–435.

———, *Erasmus* (1924), in Huizinga, *Verzamelde Werken* VI (Haarlem, 1950), pp. 3–194.

———, *The Waning of the Middle Ages*, translated by F. Hopman (New York, 1924).

Hunt, R.W., see under Southern, R.W.

Hurly, Michael, 'A Pre-Tridentine Theology of Tradition: Thomas Netter of Walden (d. 1430)', *The Heythrop Journal* 4 (1963) 348–366.

Huybregt, R., 'Hof van Holland, Zeeland en West-Friesland', in *Encyclopedie van Zeeland*, edited by the Koninklijk Zeeuwsch Genootschap der Wetenschappen, 3 vols. (Middelburg, 1982–1984), II, p. 55.

Huygens, R.C.B., 'A propos de Bérenger et son traité de l'Eucharistie', *Revue Bénédictine* 76 (1966) 133–139.

———, see also under Ganz, Peter.

Hyma, A., 'Hoen's Letter on the Eucharist and its Influence upon Carlstadt, Bucer and Zwingli', *Princeton Theological Review* 24 (1926) 124–131.

IJsewijn, J., 'The Coming of Humanism to the Low Countries', in Heiko A. Oberman and Thomas A. Brady, edd., *Itinerarium Italicum: The Profile of*

the Italian Renaissance in the Mirror of its European Transformations. SMRT, 14 (Leiden, 1975), pp. 193–304.
———, 'Lorenzo Valla's "Sprachliche Kommentare"', in August Buck and Otto Herding, edd., *Der Kommentar in der Renaissance* (Boppard, 1975), pp. 89–97.
———, 'Dorpius, Martinus', in Peter G. Bietenholz, ed., *Contemporaries of Erasmus* I, pp. 398–404.
———, 'Humanism in the Low Countries', in Albert Rabil, ed., *Renaissance Humanism: Foundations, Forms, and Legacy*, 3 vols. (Philadelphia, 1988), II, pp. 156–215.
———, *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies* I: *History and Diffusion of Neo-Latin Literature*. Supplementa Humanistica Lovaniensia, 5 (Louvain, 1990).
———, see also under Sieveke, Franz Günter.
Jacobs, Elfriede, *Die Sakramentslehre Wilhelm Farels*. Zürcher Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte, 10 (Zürich, 1978).
Janse, W., *Albert Hardenberg als Theologe: Profil eines Bucerschülers*. SHCT, 57 (Leiden, 1994).
Janssen, Antoon E.M. and Peter J.A. Nissen, 'Niederlande, Lüttich', in Antoon Schindling and Walter Ziegler, edd., *Die Territorien des Reichs im Zeitalter der Reformation und Konfessionalisierung. Land und Konfession, 1500–1650* III: *Der Nordwesten* (Münster, 1991), pp. 200–235.
Janssen, A.E.M., see under Nauta, D.
Jones, Paul H. ed., *Christ's Eucharistic Presence: A History of the Doctrine*. New York: Peter Lang, 1994.
Jong-Snep, M.G.M. de, see under Werkgroep Grote Raad.
Jonge, H.J. de, 'The Character of Erasmus' Translation of the New Testament as Reflected in His Translation of Hebrews 9', *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 14 (1984) 81–87.
———, '*Novum Testamentum a nobis versum*: The Essence of Erasmus' Edition of the New Testament', *Journal of Theological Studies* 35 (1984) 394–413.
———, 'The Date and Purpose of Erasmus's *Castigatio Novi Testamenti*: A Note on the Origins of the *Novum Instrumentum*', in A.C. Dionisotti, Anthony Grafton and Jill Kraye, edd., *The Uses of Greek and Latin: Historical Essays*. Warburg Institute Surveys and Texts, 16 (London, 1988), pp. 97–110.
Jorissen, Hans, *Die Entfaltung der Transsubstantiationslehre bis zum Beginn der Hochscholastik*. Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie, 28/1 (Münster, 1965).
Kalveen, C.A. van, *Het bestuur van bisschop en Staten in het Nedersticht, Oversticht en Drenthe, 1483–1520* (Utrecht, 1974).
Kamerling, J., 'De kerkhistoricus Annaeus Ypey (1760–1837): nuance, vooroordeel en veroordeling', NAK 55 (1974–1975) 192–236.
———, *De kerkhistoricus Willem Moll (1812–1879* (Leeuwarden, 1979).
Kaminsky, Howard, *A History of the Hussite Revolution* (Berkeley, 1967).
Kamphuis, J., 'De Avondmaalsbrief van Cornelis Hoen', in J. Kamphuis, *Altijd met goed accoord* (Amsterdam, 1973), pp. 59–84.
Kaufmann, Thomas, *Die Abendmahlstheologie der Strassburger Reformatoren bis 1528*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 81 (Tübingen, 1992).
———, 'Zwei unerkannte Schriften Bucers und Capitos zur Abendmahlsfrage aus dem Herbst 1525', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 81 (1990) 158–188.

———, 'Streittheologie und Friedensdiplomatie: die Rolle Martin Bucers im frühen Abendmahlsstreit', in Christian Krieger and Marc Lienhard, edd., *Martin Bucer and Sixteenth Century Europe: Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg (28–31 aout 1991)*, 2 vols. SMRT, 52–53 (Leiden, 1993), I, pp. 239–256.

Kemp, C.M. van der, *De eere der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk gehandhaafd tegen Ypey en Dermout*, 3 vols. (Rotterdam, 1830–1833).

Kenny, Anthony, *Wyclif* (Oxford–New York, 1985).

———, 'Wyclif', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 72 (1986 [= 1987]) 91–113.

———, 'Realism and Determinism in the Early Wyclif', in Anne Hudson and Michael Wilks, edd., *From Ockham to Wyclif*, pp. 165–177.

———, see also under Kretzmann, Norman.

Kist, N.C., 'Petrus Bloccius. Eene bijdrage tot de inwendige geschiedenis der Nederlandsche kerkhervorming en eene proeve van haren onafhankelijken oorsprong en hare zelfstandigheid', *Nederlandsch archief voor kerkelijke geschiedenis* 2 (1842) 1–113.

———, 'De Nederlandsche oorsprong der Zwingliaansche Avondmaalsleer', *Nederlandsch archief voor kerkelijke geschiedenis* 2 (1842) 114–119.

———, 'Nog iets over den Nederlandschen oorsprong der zoogenaamde Zwingliaansche Avondmaalsleer', *Nederlandsch archief voor kerkelijke geschiedenis* 3 (1843) 385–402.

Klapisch-Zuber, Christiane, *Women, Family and Ritual in Renaissance Italy* (Chicago–London, 1985).

Knappert, L., *De Opkomst van het Protestantisme in eene Noord-Nederlandsche Stad: Geschiedenis van de Hervorming binnen Leiden, van den Aanvang tot op het Beleg* (Leiden, 1908).

———, Review of J.W. Pont, *Geschiedenis van het Lutheranisme in de Nederlanden tot 1618* (Haarlem, 1911), in *Museum* 20 (1913) 229–231.

———, *Het Ontstaan en de Vestiging van het Protestantisme in de Nederlanden* (Utrecht, 1924).

Kochs, Ernst, 'Die Anfänge der ostfriesischen Reformation', *Jahrbuch der Gesellschaft für bildende Kunst und vaterländische Altertümer* 19 (1916) 109–273 and 20 (1920) 1–125.

Köhler, Walther, review of Eekhof's facsimile edition of Hoen's *Epistola*, in *Zwingliana* 3 (1913–1920) 322.

———, *Zwingli und Luther: Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl nach seinen politischen und religiösen Beziehungen* I: *Die religiöse und politische Entwicklung bis zum Marburger Religionsgespräch 1529*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte, 6 (Leipzig, 1924).

Kooiman, W.J., 'Gods maskerspel in de theologie van Luther', in M.A. Beek *et alii*, *Maskerspel voor Dr. W. Leendertsz* (Bussum, 1955), pp. 49–83.

Kooloos, W.A., 'Cornelis Hoen en zijn Avondmaalsbrief', M.A. thesis, Tilburg, Theological Faculty, 1981.

Koster-van Dijk, J.M.I., see under Werkgroep Grote Raad.

Krafft, Karl and Wilhelm Krafft, *Briefe und Documente aus der Zeit der Reformation im 16. Jahrhundert, nebst Mittheilungen über Kölnische Gelehrte und Studien im 13. und 16. Jahrhundert* (Elberfeld, 1875).

Kretzmann, Norman, Anthony Kenny and Jan Pinborg, edd., *The Cambridge*

History of Late Medieval Philosophy: From the Rediscovery of Aristotle to the Desintegration of Scholasticism, 1100–1600 (Cambridge, 1982).
Kristeller, Paul Oskar, *Iter Italicum* III (= *Alia Itinera* I): *Australia to Germany* (London–Leiden, 1983).
Kronenberg, M.E., 'Werken van Cornelius Aurelius (Donckanus) in de bibliotheek van kanunnik Mr. Jan Dircsz. van der Haer (Anno 1531)', *Het Boek* 36 (1963–1964) 69–79.
———, 'Iets over een onbekend Novum Testamentum, in Sept. 1522 te Amsterdam uitgegeven, en over de drukkerij van Corver', *Het Boek* 15 (1926) 241–256.
———, *Verboden boeken en opstandige drukkers in de hervormingstijd* (Amsterdam, 1948).
———, 'Simon Corver in de gevangenis (1536)', *Het Boek* 30 (1949–1951) 313–317.
———, *Over mensen en boeken* (The Hague, 1961).
Krüger, Friedhelm, *Bucer und Erasmus: Eine Untersuchung zum Einfluss des Erasmus auf die Theologie Martin Bucers*. Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz, 57 (Wiesbaden, 1970).
Kühler, W.J., *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche doopsgezinden in de zestiende eeuw* (2nd ed., Haarlem, 1961).
Kuttner, Stephan, see under Engen, John H. van.
Lacaze, Yvon, 'Philippe le Bon et le problème hussite: Un projet de croisade bourguignon en 1428–1429', *Revue historique* 93 (1969) 69–98.
Lambert, Malcolm, *Medieval Heresy: Popular Movements from the Gregorian Reform to the Reformation* (2nd ed.; Oxford, 1992).
Landgraff, Arthur Michael, *Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik*, 4 vols. in 6 (Regensburg, 1952–1956).
Lang, August, *Der Evangelienkommentar Martin Bucers* (Leipzig, 1900; repr. Aalen, 1972).
Lavater, Ludovicus, *Historia de origine et progressu controuersiae sacramentariae de coena Domini, ab anno natiuitatis Christi MDXXIIII vsque ad annum MDLXIII deducta* (Zurich, 1563; 2nd ed. Zurich, 1572).
Lem, G.A.C. van der, see under Haitsma Mulier, E.O.G.
Lerner, Robert E., *The Heresy of the Free Spirit in the Later Middle Ages* (Berkeley, 1972).
Lenis, C.S., 'De descriptione temporum', in: *Selected literary Essays*, Walter Hooper, ed. (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 1–14.
Leyenhorst, C.G. van, 'Hoen, Cornelis', in Peter G. Bietenholz, ed., *Contemporaries of Erasmus* II, pp. 192–193.
Lewis, C.S., '*De descriptione temporum*', in C.S. Lewis, *Selected Literary Essays*, Walter Hooper, ed. (Cambridge, 1969), pp. 1–14.
Liebeschütz, H., 'Berengar of Tours: An Attempt at Applying Logical Analysis to Theological Doctrine', in A.H. Armstrong, ed., *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy* (2nd ed.; Cambridge, 1970 [1980]), pp. 600–608.
Liebs, Detlef, ed., *Lateinische Rechtsregeln und Rechtssprichwörter* (Munich, 1982).
Lindeboom, J., *Erasmus: Onderzoek naar zijne theologie en zijn godsdienstig gemoedsbestaan* (Leiden, 1909).

———, *Het bijbelsch humanisme in Nederland* (Leiden, 1913).
———, *Het bijbels humanisme in Nederland: Erasmus en de vroege Reformatie*, with an introduction by C. Augustijn (Leeuwarden, 1982).
———, 'Honderd jaren kerkgeschiedenis naar honderd jaren Archief', NAK 22 (1929) 199–218.
———, *De confessioneele ontwikkeling der Reformatie in de Nederlanden*. Kerkhistorische studiën, 3 (The Hague, 1946).
———, see also under Reitsma, J.
Locher, Gottfried Wilhelm. "Zwingli en de Nederlanden" in *Reformatie-studies: congresbundel 1989*. Red. van Wulfert de Greef an M. van Campen. Kampen: de Groot Goudriaan in samenwerking met de Stichting ter Bevordering van de Kennis van de Reformatie, 1990. Pp. 16–27.
Loeb, Isidore, 'La controverse religieuse entre les chrétiens et les juifs au Moyen Age en France et en Espagne', *Revue de l'histoire des religions* IX-17 (1888) 311–337 and IX-18 (1888) 133–156.
Loeff, G.M.C., *De Nederlandsche kerkgeschiedschrijver Geeraardt Brandt* (Utrecht, 1864).
Loewenich, Walther von, *Luthers Theologia crucis* (2nd ed., Munich, 1933).
Long, Isaäc le, *Boekzaal der Nederduitsche bybels* (Amsterdam, 1732).
Loosjes, J., *Geschiedenis der lutherse kerk in de Nederlanden* (The Hague, 1921).
Looz-Corswarem, Clemens von, 'Die Kölner Artikelserie von 1525: Hintergründe und Verlauf des Aufruhrs von 1525 in Köln', in F. Petri, ed., *Kirche und gesellschaftlicher Wandel in deutschen und niederländischen Städten der werdenden Neuzeit* (Cologne–Vienna, 1980), pp. 65–101.
Loserth, Johann, *Huss und Wyclif* (2nd ed.; Munich-Berlin, 1925).
Lourdaux, W., 'Het boekenbezit en het boekengebruik bij de Moderne Devoten', in *Studies over boekenbezit en boekengebruik in de Nederlanden vóór 1600*. Archief- en bibliotheekwezen België/Archives et bibliothèques de Belgique, extra no. 11 (Brussels, 1974), pp. 247–325.
Lubac, Henri de, *Corpus mysticum: l'eucharistie au Moyen Age* (2nd ed.; Paris, 1949).
Luther, Johannes, *Die Titeleinfassungen der Reformationszeit* I–III (Leipzig, 1909–1913).
MacDonald, A.J., *Berengar and the Reform of Sacramental Doctrine* (London, 1930).
Macy, Gary, *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic period: A Study of the Salvific Function of the Sacrament according to the Theologians, c. 1080–c. 1220* (Oxford, 1984).
———, 'Berengar's Legacy as Heresiarch', in Peter Ganz, R.B.C. Huygens and Friedrich Niewöhner, edd., *Auctoritas und Ratio*, pp. 47–67.
———, 'Of Mice and Manna: Quid Mus Sumit as a Pastoral Question', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 58 (1991) 157–166.
———, 'The Dogma of Transubstantiation in the Middle Ages', *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 45 (1994) 11–41.
Margolin, Jean-Claude, 'Otto Brunfels dans le milieu évangélique rhénan', in Georges Livet, Francis Rapp and Jean Rott, edd., *Strasbourg au coeur religieux du XVIe siècle: Hommage à Lucien Febvre* (Strasbourg, 1977), pp. 111–141.
Meier, Ludwig, 'Wilsnack als Spiegel deutscher Vorreformation', *Zeitschrift für Religionsgeschichte* 3 (1951) 53–69.

Meiners, Eduard, *Oostvrieschlandts kerkelijke geschiedenisse*, 2 vols. (Groningen, 1738).
Meyer, W., see under Halm, K.
Meyers, Johanna J.M., *Authors Edited, Translated or Annotated by Desiderius Erasmus: A Short-Title Catalogue of the Works in the City Library of Rotterdam* (Rotterdam, 1982).
Milde, Wolfgang, 'Einleitung', in Beringerius Turonensis, *Rescriptum contra Lanfrannum. Faksimileausgabe der Handschrift Wolfenbüttel, Herzog Augustbibliothek Cod. Guelf. 101 Weissenburg.* CCCM 84A (Turnhout, 1988), pp. 6–20.
Misset, C.J., see under Blom, J.C.H.
Moeller, Bernd, *Reichsstadt und Reformation* (Gütersloh, 1962; repr. Berlin, 1987).
———, *Imperial Cities and the Reformation: Three Essays* (Durham, N.C., 1982).
Molhuysen, P.C., 'Cornelius Aurelius', NAK 2 (1903) 1–35. [Molhuysen, P.C.,] *Bibliotheca Universitatis Leidensis. Codices Manuscripti* I: *Codices Vulcaniani* (Leiden, 1910).
Molin, Jean-Baptiste and Protais Mutembe, *Le rituel du marriage en France du XIIe au XIVe siècle.* Théologie historique, 26 (Paris, 1974).
Moll, W., 'Aanteekeningen van een tijdgenoot, betreffende de opkomende Hervorming en hare verbreiding, inzonderheid in het fraterhuis te Doesburg', *Kerkhistorisch archief* 3 (1862) 108–115.
———, 'Johannes van Alkmaar voor het kerkgericht der kerkvergadering van Constanz', *Studiën en bijdragen op 't gebied der historische theologie* 3 (1876) 1–25.
Molnár, Amedeo, 'Les réponses de Jean Huss aux quarante-cinq articles', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 31 (1964) 85–99.
———, see also under Gonnet, Jean.
Montclos, Jean de, *Lanfranc et Bérenger: la controverse eucharistique du XIe siècle.* Spicilegium sacrum Lovaniense: études et documents, 37 (Louvain, 1971).
Moolenbroek, Jaap van, 'The Correspondance of Wessel Gansfort: An Inventory', NAKG 84 (2004) 95–125.
Mori, Gustav, 'Peter Schöffer der Jüngere', in *Altmeister der Druckschrift* (Frankfurt a.M., 1940), pp. 81–88.
Mout, M.E.H.N., *Bohemen en de Nederlanden in de zestiende eeuw* (Leiden, 1975).
Müller, Joseph, *Die deutschen Katechismen der Böhmischen Brüder.* Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica, 6 (Berlin, 1887; repr. Nieuwkoop, 1970).
Muller, Jean, *Bibliographie strasbourgeoise* II–III. Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana, 90, 95 (Baden-Baden, 1985–1986).
Mutembe, Protais, see under Molin, Jean-Baptiste.
Muurling, W., *Over de echt christelijke beginselen der oorspronkelijke Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk* (Groningen, 1849).
Nauta, D., 'De Reformatie in Nederland in de historiogafie', in P.M.A. Geurts and A.E.M. Janssen, edd., *Geschiedschrijving in Nederland* II: *Geschiedbeoefening* (The Hague, 1981), pp. 206–227.
Neander, August, *Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche* VI (Hamburg, 1852).
Nellen, Henk J.M. and Edwin Rabbie, *Hugo Grotius–Theologian. Essays in Honour of G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes.* SHCT 55 (Leiden, 1994).

Nerdenus, Henricus Antonides, *Praefatio dedicatoria in qua et purioris religionis per Belgium instauratae historia et eius retinendae necessitas exponitur*, in *Systema theologicum disputationibus publicis propositum in Academia Franequerensi, praeside Henrico Antonii Nerdeno* (Franeker, 1611), A2recto–E1recto.

Neumann, Augustin, *Francouzká Hussitica*. Studie e texty k nábozenskym dejinám Ceskym III,2–4 (Olmütz, 1923).

Nierop, H.F.K. van, *Van ridders tot regenten: de Hollandse adel in de zestiende en de eerste helft van de zeventiende eeuw* (2nd. ed., Amsterdam, 1990).

Niewöhner, Friedrich, see under Ganz, Peter.

Nissen, Peter J.A., see under Janssen, Antoon E.M.

O'Rourke Boyle, Marjorie, 'Nicolaas Baechem', in Peter G. Bietenholz, ed., *Contemporaries of Erasmus* I, pp. 81–83.

Oberman, Heiko Augustinus, *The Harvest of Medieval Theology: Gabriel Biel and Late Medieval Nominalism* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1963).

———, *Forerunners of the Reformation: The Shape of Late Medieval Thought Illustrated by Key Documents* (New York, 1966; repr. Philadelphia, 1981).

———, ed., *Die Kirche im Zeitalter der Reformation*. Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte in Quellen, 3 (Neukirchen–Vluyn, 1981; repr. 1985).

———, 'The "Extra"-Dimension in the Theology of Calvin', in Oberman, *The Dawn of the Reformation: Essays in Late Medieval and Reformation Thought* (Edinburgh, 1986), pp. 234–258.

———, '*Die Gelehrten die Verkehrten*: Popular Response to Learned Culture in the Renaissance and Reformation', in Steven Ozment, ed., *Religion and Culture in the Renaissance and the Reformation*. Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, 9 (Kirksville, 1989), pp. 43–63.

Oorthuys, G., *Anastasius' 'Wechwijser', Bullingers 'Huysboeck' en Calvijns 'Institutie' vergeleken in hun leer van God en mensch. Eene bladzijde uit de vaderlandsche theologie vóór de Synode van Dordrecht* (Leiden, 1919).

Oosterbaan, D.P., 'School en kerk in het Middeleeuwse Delft (II)', *Spiegel der Historie* 1 (1966) 111–118.

———, *De Oude Kerk te Delft gedurende de Middeleeuwen* (The Hague, 1973).

Paolini, Lorenzo, 'Italian Catharism and Written Culture', in Peter Biller and Anne Hudson, edd., *Heresy and Literacy, 1000–1530*, pp. 83–103.

Pater, Calvin Augustine, *Karlstadt as the Father of the Baptist Movements: The Emergence of Lay Protestantism* (Toronto, 1984).

Patschovsky, Alexander, *Die Anfänge einer ständigen Inquisition in Böhmen: Ein Prager Inquisitore-Handbuch aus der ersten Hälfte des 14. Jahrhunderts*. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters, 3 (Berlin–New York, 1975).

———, 'Nachwort', in Arno Borst, *Die Katharer* (Freiburg, 1991), pp. 327–334.

Payne, John B., *Erasmus: his theology of the sacraments* (Richmond, Va., 1970).

Pegel, R.H., 'Prediking voor de leken in de stad Utrecht', in H. ten Boom, *et alii*, edd., *Utrechters entre-deux*, pp. 112–146.

Pegg, Michael A., *A Catalogue of German Reformation Pamphlets (1516–1546) in Libraries of Great Britain and Ireland*. Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana, 45 (Baden-Baden, 1973).

———, *A Catalogue of German Reformation Pamphlets (1516–1550) in Swiss Libraries*. Bibliotheca Bibliographica Aureliana, 99 (Baden-Baden, 1983).

Pennington, Kenneth, see under Engen, John H. van.
Penon, Georg, *Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis der Nederlandsche letterkunde* II (Groningen, 1881).
Peremans, Nicole, "Erasme et Bucer d'apres leur correspondance," in *Erasmus of Rotterdam; quintcentennial symposium*, ed. by Richard L. de Moeln. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1971.
Peschke, Erhard, *Die Theologie der Böhmischen Brüder in ihrer Frühzeit* I/1 (Stuttgart, 1935).
Pettegree, Andrew, *Emden and the Dutch Revolt: Exile and the Development of Reformed Protestantism* (Oxford, 1992).
Pijper, F., 'Levensbericht van Johannes Gerardus Rijk Acquoy', *Levensberichten der afgestorven medeleden van de Maatschappij der Nederlandsche Letterkunde te Leiden* (Leiden, 1898), pp. 290–331.
———, 'Kist, Moll en Acquoy, de grondvesters der Nederlandsche historische school', NAK 4 (1907) 237–252.
———, *Erasmus en de Nederlandsche Reformatie* (Leiden, 1907).
———, 'Geestelijke stroomingen in Nederland voor de opkomst van het Remonstrantisme', in G.J. Heering, ed., *De Remonstranten: Gedenkboek bij het 300-jarig bestaan der Remonstrantsche Broederschap* (Leiden, s.a. [1919]), pp. 37–60.
Pinborg, Jan, see under Kretzmann, Norman.
Planitz, Hanz and Thea Buyken, *Bibliographie zur deutschen Rechtsgeschichte* I (Frankfurt, 1952).
Pollet, J.V., *Martin Bucer. Études sur la correspondance, avec de nombreux textes inédits*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1958–1962).
———, *Martin Bucer: Études sur les relations de Bucer avec les Pays-Bas, l'Électorat de Cologne et l'Allemagne du Nord, avec de nombreux textes inédits*, 2 vols. SMRT, 33–34 (Leiden, 1985).
Pont, J.W., *Geschiedenis van het Lutheranisme in de Nederlanden tot 1618* (Haarlem, 1911).
Post, R.R., *Scholen en onderwijs in Nederland gedurende de Middeleeuwen* (Utrecht–Antwerp, 1954).
———, *Kerkgeschiedenis van Nederland in de Middeleeuwen*, 2 vols. (Utrecht–Antwerp, 1957).
———, *The Modern Devotion: Confrontation with Reformation and Humanism*. SMRT, 3 (Leiden, 1968).
Posthumus Meyjes, G.H.M., 'De doorwerking van de Moderne Devotie, met name bij de Remonstranten', in P. Bange *et alii*, edd., *De doorwerking van de Moderne Devotie: Windesheim, 1387–1987* (Hilversum, 1988), pp. 81–94.
Postma, Folkert, *Viglius van Aytta als humanist en diplomaat, 1507–1549* (Zutphen, 1983).
Preus, James S., *Carlstadt's* Ordinaciones *and Luther's Liberty: a study of the Wittenberg Movement, 1521–1522*. Harvard Theological Studies, 26 (Cambridge, Mass., 1974).
Pruett, Gordon E. "A Protestant Doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence." *Calvin Theological Journal* 10 (1975): 142–174.
Quétif, Jacques and Jacques Échard, *Scriptores Ordinis Praedicatorum recensiti, notisque historicis et criticis illustrati*, 2 vols. (Paris, 1719–1721).

Raa, C.M.G. ten, 'Nicolaes Everaerts', in *Nationaal Biografisch Woordenboek* 7 (Brussels, 1977), pp. 214–231.
Raynaud de Lage, G., *Alain de Lille: poète du XIIe siècle* (Montreal–Paris, 1951).
Readling, Eric L. "The Reformation and Christ's Presence: An Exploration of the Presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper as Defined in the Eucharistic Theologies of the Roman Catholic Church and Sixteenth-Century Theologians Martin Bucer, Ulrich Zwingli, and John Calvin." Th.M. thesis, Duke University, 1999.
Reedijk, C., 'Erasmus' final modesty', in *Actes du congrès Érasme* (Amsterdam, 1971), pp. 174–192.
Regenboog, Jacobus, *Historie der Remonstranten*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1774–1776).
Reitsma, J. and J. Lindeboom, *Geschiedenis van de Hervorming en de Hervormde Kerk der Nederlanden* (4th ed., The Hague, 1933; 5th ed., The Hague, 1949).
Reusch, Albert, 'Wilhelm Gnapheus, der erste Rector des Elbinger Gymnasiums', in *Zu der öffentlichen Prüfung der Schüler des Gymnasiums zu Elbing* I (Elbing, 1868) 1–39 and VIII (Elbing, 1877) 1–38.
Reusch, Franz Heinrich, *Der Index der verbotenen Bücher: ein Beitrag zur Kirchen- und Literaturgeschichte* I (Bonn, 1883; repr. Aalen, 1967).
Reynolds, L.D. and N.G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (2nd. ed.; Oxford, 1974).
Rhijn, Maarten van, *Wessel Gansfort* (The Hague, 1917).
———, 'Nawoord. Nieuwere Erasmus-waardering. Troeltsch en Pijper', in Van Rhijn, *Studiën over Luther's rechtvaardigingsleer* (Amsterdam, 1921).
———, *Studiën over Wessel Gansfort en zijn tijd* (Utrecht, 1933).
———, 'De invloed van Wessel Gansfort', in *Studiën over Wessel Gansfort en zijn tijd*, pp. 38–73.
———, 'De dogmenhistorische achtergrond van Wessel Gansfort's Avondmaalsleer', in *Studiën over Wessel Gansfort en zijn tijd*, pp. 74–90.
———, 'Jacobus Hoeck', in *Studiën over Wessel Gansfort en zijn tijd*, pp. 112–126.
———, 'Goswinus van Halen', in *Studiën over Wessel Gansfort en zijn tijd*, pp. 137–159.
Ritter, François, *Histoire de l'imprimerie alsacienne aux XVe et XVIe siècles* (Strasbourg–Paris, 1955).
Roelevink, J., *Gedicteerd verleden: het onderwijs in de algemene geschiedenis aan de universiteit te Utrecht, 1735–1839* (Amsterdam–Maarssen, 1986).
Rompaey, J. van, see under Smidt, J.Th. de.
Roodhuyzen, Hendrik, *Het leven van Guilhelmus Gnapheus, een' der eerste Hervormers van Nederland* (Amsterdam, 1858).
Rott, Jean, *Investigationes Historicae: Églises et sociétés au XVIe siècle. Gesammelte Aufsätze*, 2 vols. (Strasbourg, 1986).
———, 'Martin Bucer und die Schweiz: Drei unbekannte Briefe von Zwingli, Bucer und Vadian (1530, 1531, 1536)', in *Investigationes Historicae* II, pp. 203–234.
———, 'Correspondance de Bucer', in *Investigationes Historicae* II, pp. 158–164.
———, 'Bucer et les débuts de la querelle sacramentaire: L'instruction donnée à Gregoire Casselius pour sa mission auprès de Luther (octobre 1525)', in *Investigationes Historicae* II, pp. 182–202.

Royaards, H.J., 'Brieven aan Prof. P. Hofstede de Groot, over den gang der christelijke godgeleerdheid in Nederland', *Nederlandsch archief voor kerkelijke geschiedenis* 2 (1842) 329–382.

Rubin, Miri, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge, 1991).

Rückert, Hanns, 'Das Eindringen der Tropuslehre in die schweizerische Auffassung vom Abendmahl', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 37 (1940) 199–222.

Rummel, Erika, *Erasmus' Annotations on the New Testament: From Philologist to Theologian* (Toronto, 1986).

———, *Erasmus and his Catholic Critics*, 2 vols. Bibliotheca Humanistica et Reformatorica, 45 (Nieuwkoop, 1989).

Rupp, Gordon, *Patterns of Reformation* (London, 1969).

Russel, Paul A., *Lay Theology in the Reformation: Popular Pamphleteers in Southwest Germany, 1521–1525* (Cambridge, 1986).

Santbergen, René van, *Un procès de religion à Louvain: Paul de Roovere 1542–1546* (Brussels, 1953).

Santing, C.G., see under Akkerman, F.

Scheltema, P., *Inventaris van het Amsterdamse archief* III (Amsterdam, 1874).

Schelven, A.A. van, 'Zur Biographie und Theologie des Valérand Poullain', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 47 (1928) 227–249.

Schepper, H. de, 'De burgerlijke overheden en hun permanente kaders, 1480–1579', in *(N)AGN* V, pp. 312–349.

———, see also under Wijffels, Alain.

Schmid, Alois, '*Poeta et orator a Caesare laureatus*: Die Dichterkrönungen Kaiser Maximilians I.', *Historisches Jahrbuch* 109 (1989) 56–108.

Schmidt, Charles, *Jean Knobloch, 1500–1528*. Répertoire bibliographique strasbourgeois jusque vers 1530, 7 (Strasbourg, 1895).

Schoockius, Martinus, *Liber de bonis vulgo ecclesiasticis dictis* (Groningen, 1651).

Schottenloher, Karl, *Philipp Ulhart: ein Augsburger Winkeldrucker und Helfershelfer der "Schwärmer" und "Wiedertäufer" (1523–1529)*. Historische Forschungen, 4 (Munich–Freising, 1921; repr. Nieuwkoop, 1967).

Schumacher, Bruno, *Niederländische Ansiedlungen im Herzogtum Preussen zur Zeit Herzog Albrechts (1525–1568)* (Leipzig, 1903).

Scribner, Robert, 'Heterodoxy, Literacy and Print in the Early German Reformation', in Peter Biller and Anne Hudson, edd., *Literacy and Heresy, ca. 1000–1530* (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 255–278.

———, 'Why was there no Reformation in Cologne?', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 49 (1976) 217–241.

Seibt, Ferdinand, 'Gab es einen böhmischen Frühhumanismus?', in Hans-Bernard Harder and Hans Rothe, edd., *Studien zum Humanismus in den böhmischen Ländern* (Cologne–Vienna, 1988), pp. 1–19.

Selge, Kurt-Victor, 'Heidelberger Ketzerprozesse in der Frühzeit der hussitischen Revolution', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 82 (1971) 167–202.

Sepp, Christiaan, *Bibliotheek van Nederlandsche kerkgeschiedschrijvers* (Leiden, 1886).

———, *Verboden lectuur. Een drietal Indices librorum prohibitorum toegelicht* (Leiden, 1889).

Sernee, J.M., and S.W.A. Drossaers and W.G. Feith, *De archieven van kloosters en andere stichtingen in Delfland* ('s-Gravenhage, 1920).
Sieveke, Franz Günter, 'Der Dialogführung im *Acolastus* des Gnaphaeus', in J. IJsewijn and E. Kessler, edd., *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Lovaniensis: Proceedings of the First International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies*. Humanistische Bibliothek I,20 (Louvain–Munich, 1973), pp. 595–601.
Smahel, Frantisek, '*Doctor evangelicus super omnes evangelistas*: Wyclif's Fortune in Hussite Bohemia', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 43 (1970) 16–34.
Smid, Menno, *Ostfriesische Kirchengeschichte*. Ostfriesland im Schutze des Deiches, 6 (Pewsum, 1974).
Smidt, J.Th. de, and J. van Rompaey, edd., *Chronologische lijsten van de geëxtendeerde sententiën berustende in het archief van de Grote Raad van Mechelen* III: *1531–1541* (Brussels, 1979).
———, see also under Werkgroep Grote Raad.
Sousedík, Stanislav, 'Huss et la doctrine eucharistique "rémanentiste"', *Divinitas* 3 (1977) 383–407.
Southern, R.W., 'Lanfranc of Bec and Berengar of Tours', in R.W. Hunt, W.A. Pantin and R.W. Southern, edd., *Studies in Medieval History presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke* (Oxford, 1948), pp. 27–48.
Spruyt, B.J., 'Humanisme, Evangelisme en Reformatie in de Nederlanden, 1520–1530', in M. van Campen and W. de Greef, edd., *Reformatie in meervoud. Congresbundel 1990* (Kampen, 1991), pp. 26–54.
———, 'Listrius *lutherizans*: his *Epistola theologica aduersus Dominicanos Suollenses*', *Sixteenth Century Journal* 22 (1991) 727–751.
———, 'Martin Bucers *Gulden brief*: de irenische Bucer in de polemiek tussen Remonstranten en Contra-Remonstranten', in F. van der Pol, ed., *Bucer en de kerk* (Kampen, 1992), pp. 84–174.
———, 'Hinne Rode (ca. 1480–ca. 1539): het leven en de ontwikkeling van de dissidente Rector van het Utrechtse fraterhuis', in H. ten Boom *et alii*, edd., *Utrechters entre-deux*, pp. 21–42.
———, 'Wessel Gansfort and Cornelis Hoen's *Epistola Christiana*: "The ring as a pledge of my love"', in F. Akkerman, G.C. Santing and A.J. Vanderjagt, edd., *Wessel Gansfort and Northern Humanism*, pp. 122–141.
———, 'Das Echo des Jan Hus und der hussitischen Bewegung in den burgundischen Niederlanden, ca. 1420–ca. 1530', *Jan Hus. Zwischen Zeiten, Völkern, Konfessionen*. Veröffentlichungen des Collegium Carolinum, 85 (München, 1997), pp. 283–301.
Staedtke, Joachim, 'Voraussetzungen der Schweizer Abendmahlslehre', *Theologische Zeitschrift* 16 (1960) 19–32.
Staehelin, Ernst, *Oekolampad-Bibliographie* (Basel, 1918; repr. Nieuwkoop, 1963).
———, *Das theologische Lebenswerk Johannes Oekolampads*. Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte, 21 (Leipzig, 1939).
Steitz, Georg Eduard, 'Dr. Gerhard Westerburg, der Leiter des Bürgeraufstandes zu Frankfurt a.M. im Jahre 1525', *Archiv für Frankfurts Geschichte und Kunst* n.s., 5 (1872) 1–215.
Steller, Paul W. *Martin Bucer's influence on protestant eucharistic theology: a modern*

catholic appraisal. MRE thesis. Washington: Catholic University of America, 1971. 103 pages.

Sterk, J., *Philips van Bourgondië (1465–1524), bisschop van Utrecht, als protagonist van de Renaissance. Zijn leven en maecenaat* (Zutphen, 1980).

Stevenson, Kenneth W. "Zwingli, Bucer, Calvin, and Knox" in his *Eucharistic and Offering*. New York: Pueblo Publishing Co., 1986, pp. 136–141.

Stock, Brian, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton, 1983).

Streefkerk, C., see under Werkgroep Grote Raad.

Studia eucharistica DCCi anni a condito festo sanctissimi corporis Christi (Bussum–Antwerp, 1946).

Synopsis purioris theologiae, H. Bavinck, ed. (6th ed., Leiden, 1881).

Tabor, Otto, see under Barbosa, Augustinus.

Tanis, James, 'East Friesland and the Reformed Reformation', *Calvin Theological Journal* 26 (1991) 313–349.

Thompson, Nicholas. *Eucharistic sacrifice and patristic tradition in the theology of Martin Bucer, 1534–1546*. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Thomson, Williel R., *The Latin Writings of John Wyclif*. Subsidia mediaevalia, 14 (Toronto, 1983).

Til, Salomon van, *Inleydinge tot de profetische schriften…* (Dordrecht, 1684).

Tilmans, Karin, *Historiography and Humanism in Holland in the Age of Erasmus: Aurelius and the* Divisiekroniek *of 1517*. Bibliotheca Humanistica et Reformatorica, 51 (Nieuwkoop, 1992).

———, 'Erasmus and Aurelius and Their Lives of Jerome: A Study of Cooperation and Dependence', in Alexander Dalzell, Charles Fantazzi and Richard J. Schoeck, edd., *Acta Conventus Neo-Latini Torontonensis: Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Neo-Latin Studies*. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 86 (Binghamton, N.Y., 1991), pp. 755–765.

Tongerloo, L. van, 'Pastoors in veelvoud', in H. ten Boom, *et alii*, edd., *Utrechters entre-deux*, pp. 75–111.

Toorenenbergen, J.J. van, 'Hinne Rode (Joh. Rodius), Rector van de Hieronymusschool te Utrecht (–1522), predikant te Norden (–1530), in betrekking tot de Anabaptisten', *Archief voor Nederlandse Kerkgeschiedenis* 3 (1889) 90–101.

Toussaint, J., *Les relations diplomatiques de Philippe le Bon avec le concile de Bâle, 1431–1449* (Louvain, 1942).

Tracy, James D., *Holland under Habsburg Rule, 1506–1566: The Formation of A Body Politic* (Berkeley, 1990).

Trapman, J., *De Summa der godliker scrifturen (1523)* (Leiden, 1978).

———, 'Le rôle des "sacramentaires" des origines de la Réforme jusqu'en 1530 aux Pays-Bas', NAK 63 (1983) 1–24.

———, 'Leidse kerkhistorici over Erasmus in het begin van de twintigste eeuw', in *Erasmus en Leiden. Catalogus van de tentoonstelling gehouden in het Academisch Historisch Museum te Leiden van 23 oktober tot 19 december 1986* (Leiden, 1986), pp. 83–86.

———, 'Ioannes Sartorius (ca. 1500–1557), gymnasiarch te Amsterdam en te Noordwijk, als erasmiaan en spiritualist', NAK 70 (1990) 30–51.

———, 'Grotius and Erasmus', in H.J.M. Nellen and E. Rabbi, edd., *Hugo*

Grotius Theologian. Essays in Honour of G.H.M. Posthumus Meyjes. SHCT, 55 (Leiden, 1994), pp. 77–98.

———, '*Solet* instead of *solebat* in Erasmus and other Neo-Latin authors', *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 44 (1995) 197–201.

Trigland, Jacobus, *Kerckelijcke geschiedenissen* (Leiden, 1650).

Troje, Hans Eric, 'Die Literatur des gemeinen Rechts unter dem Einfluss des Humanismus', in Helmut Coing, ed., *Handbuch der Quellen und Literatur der neueren europäischen Privatrechtsgeschichte* II/1 (Munich, 1977), pp. 615–795.

Ullmann, C., *Johann Wessel, ein Vorgänger Luthers. Zur Characteristik der christlichen Kirche und Theologie in ihrem Übergang aus dem Mittelalter in die Reformationszeit* (Hamburg, 1834).

———, *Johannes Wessel, een voorganger van Luther*, trans. W.N. Munting (Leiden, 1835).

———, *Reformatoren vor der Reformation, vornehmlich in Deutschland und den Niederlanden*, 2 vols. (Hamburg, 1841–1842; repr. Gotha, 1866).

Ursinus, Zacharias, *Schat-boeck der verklaringen over den Nederlandtschen Catechismus, uyt de Latijnsche lessen van Dr. Zacharias Ursinus … nieuws oversien door Johannes Spiljardus* (Amsterdam, 1664; 2nd ed., Amsterdam, 1694; 3rd ed., Gorinchem, 1736).

Uytven, R. van, 'Bijdrage tot de sociale geschiedenis van de protestanten te Leuven in de eerste helft der XVIe eeuw', *Mededelingen van de Geschied- en Oudheidkundige Kring voor Leuven en omgeving* (1963), pp. 3–38.

Valkema Blouw, Paul, 'The Van Oldenborch and Vanden Merberghe pseudonyms *or* why Frans Fraet had to die', *Quaerendo* 22 (1992) 165–190 and 245–272.

Vanderjagt, A.J., *Laurens Pignon, O.P.: Confessor of Philip the Good. Ideas on Jurisdiction and the Estates* (Venlo, 1985).

———, see also under Akkerman, F. Vasoli, Cesare, 'Il *Contra haereticos* di Alano di Lilla', *Bulletino dell' Istituto storico per il medio evo* 75 (1963) 123–172.

Velden, H.E.J.M. van der, *Rodolphus Agricola (Roelof Huusman), een Nederlandsche humanist der vijftiende eeuw* (Leiden, s.a.).

Verdam, J., see under Verwijs, E.

Verhoeven, G., *Devotie en negotie: Delft als bedevaartplaats in de late middeleeuwen* (Amsterdam, 1992).

Verwijs, E. and J. Verdam, edd., *Middelnederlandsch woordenboek*, 11 vols. (The Hague, 1855–1952).

Vis, G.N.M., 'Egmond en zijn bronnen', in G.N.M. Vis, M. Mostert and P.J. Margry, edd., *Heiligenlevens, Annalen en Kronieken: Geschiedschrijving in middeleeuws Egmond*. Egmondse studiën, 1 (Hilversum, 1990).

Visser, Derk, 'Neither Humanist nor Protestant: Ring, Betrothal and Marriage in Literary and Artistic Discourse as Metaphors of Salvation by Grace', in Hans R. Guggisberg and Gottfried G. Krodel, edd., *Die Reformation in Deutschland und Europa: Interpretationen und Debatten* (Gütersloh, 1993), pp. 118–135.

Vocht, Henry de, *Monumenta Humanistica Lovaniensia: Texts and Studies about Louvain Humanists in the First Half of the Sixteenth Century* (Louvain, 1934).

———, *History of the Foundation and Rise of the Collegium Trilingue Lovaniense, 1517–1550* I (Louvain, 1951).
———, *John Dantiscus and his Netherlandish Friends as revealed by their correspondence, 1522–1546* (Louvain, 1961).
Voolstra, S., *Het Woord is vlees geworden: de melchioritisch-menniste incarnatieleer* (Kampen, 1982).
Voskuil, J.J., 'Van onderpand tot teken. De geschiedenis van de trouwring als voorbeeld van functieverschuiving', *Volkskundig bulletin I*, 2 (December 1975), pp. 47–79.
Vree, J., *De Groninger godgeleerden: de oorsprongen en de eerste periode van hun optreden (1820–1843)* (Kampen, 1984).
Vreese, Willem de, 'Een lofdicht van Geldenhauer op Erasmus', *Het Boek* 13 (1924) 337–342.
Wailes, Stephen L., 'Is Gnapheus' *Acolastus* a Lutheran Play?', in Francis G. Gentry, ed., *Semper idem et novus: Festschrift for Frank Banta* (Göppingen, 1988), pp. 345–357.
Walsh, Katherine, see under Catto, J.I.
Wedekind, W.G.Ph.E., *Bijdrage tot de kennis van de ontwikkeling van de procesgang in civiele zaken voor het Hof van Holland in de eerste helft van de zestiende eeuw* (Assen, 1971).
Weiss, James Michael, 'The Six Lives of Rudolph Agricola: Forms and Functions of Humanist Biography', *Humanistica Lovaniensia* 30 (1981) 19–39.
Weiss, N., 'Le premier traité protestant en langue française: La Summe de l'escripture saincte, 1523', *Bulletin de la société de l'histoire du protestantisme français* 68 (1919) 63–79.
Werkgroep Grote Raad (J.Th. de Smidt, M.G.M. de Jong-Snep, J.M.I. Koster-van Dijk, A. Wijffels), 'Slotens verzet zet geen zoden aan de Spaarndammerdijk', in C. Streefkerk and S. Faber, edd., *Ter recognitie: opstellen aangeboden aan Prof. Mr. H. van der Linden bij zijn afscheid als hoogleraar in de Nederlandse rechtsgeschiedenis aan de Vrije Universiteit* (Hilversum, 1987), pp. 265–274.
Werner, Ernst, *Nachrichte über spätmittelalterliche Ketzer aus tsechoslovakischen Archiven und Bibliotheken* (Leipzig, 1963).
———, *Jan Hus: Welt und Umwelt eines Prager Frühreformators*. Forschungen zur mittelalterlichen Geschichte, 34 (Weimar, 1991).
Whatmore, L.E., 'A Defender of the Eucharist: Blessed Germain Gardiner, 1544', in *Studia eucharistica DCCi anni a condito festo sanctissimi corporis Christi, 1246–1946* (Bussum–Antwerp, 1946), pp. 246–268.
Wijffels, Alain, *Qui millies allegatur: Les allégations du droit savant dans les dossiers du Grand Conseil de Malines (causes septentrionales, ca. 1460–1580)*, 2 vols. (Amsterdam, 1985).
———, '*Mos italicus* in der Anwaltspraxis des Grossen Rates zu Mecheln und des Hofes von Holland (ca. 1460–1580)', in H. de Schepper, ed., *Höchste Gerichtsbarkeit im Spätmittelalter und der frühen Neuzeit* (Amsterdam, s.d. [1985]), pp. 105–123.
———, '*Iudicium time*', *Rechtshistorisches Journal* 3 (1984) 169–174.
———, see also under Werkgroep Grote Raad.
Wilks, M.J., 'The early Oxford Wyclif: Papalist or Nominalist?', in G.J. Cum-

ing, ed., The Church and Academic Learning. Studies in Church History, 5 (Leiden, 1969), pp. 69–98.
———, see also under Hudson, Anne.
Williams, George Hunston, *The Radical Reformation*. [3rd, revised edition] Sixteenth Century Essays and Studies, 15 (Kirksville, Missouri, 1992).
Wilson, N.G., see under Reynolds, L.D.
Winter, Eduard, *Frühhumanismus: Seine Entwicklung in Böhmen und deren europäischen Bedeutung für die Kirchenreformbestrebungen im 14. Jahrhundert* (Berlin, 1964).
Witteveen, K.M., *Daniel Gerdes* (Groningen, 1963).
Wolfs, S.P., *Das Groninger 'Religionsgespräch' (1523) und seine Hintergründe* (Utrecht–Nijmegen, 1959).
Wolfs, S.P., *Middeleeuwse Dominicanenkloosters in Nederland: bijdrage tot een monasticon* (Assen, 1984).
Woltjer, J.J., *Friesland in de Hervormingstijd* (Leiden, 1962).
Workman, H.B., *John Wyclif: A Study of the English Medieval Church*, 2 vols. (Oxford, 1926).
Wtenbogaert, Johannes, *De kerckelicke historie* (s.l., 1646).
Ypey, A., *Beknopte geschiedenis van de Hervorming der christelijke kerk in de zestiende eeuw* (Groningen, 1817).
Ypey, A. and I.J. Dermout, *Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk*, 4 vols. (Breda, 1819–1827).
Zorzin, Alejandro, 'Karlstadts "Dialogus vom Tauff der Kinder" in einem anonymen Wormser Druck aus dem Jahr 1527. Ein Beitrag zur Karlstadt-bibliographie', *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte* 79 (1988) 27–58.
———, *Karlstadt als Flugschriftenautor* (Göttingen, 1990).

INDEX OF PERSONAL NAMES

Acquoy, J.G.R., 13, 33
Adelmann of Liège, 138, 141
Adrian VI, pope, 17, 44, 48, 51, 81–82
Agricola, Rudolph, 3, 22, 46, 59
Akkerman, F., 3, 116
Alain of Lille, 129, 143–146
Alardus Aemstelredamus, 3, 46
Alber, Mattheus, 175, 205, 206, 212
Albert of Brandenburg, duke, 65, 93
Albrecht of Prussia, duke, 211
Alciatus, 58
Aleander, Jerome, 162
Alger of Liège, 105, 113, 114, 141, 142, 146
Alix, Pierre, 107
Alkmaar, John of, 153
Allen, P.S., 3, 48–50, 58, 59, 75, 79, 80, 93, 105, 167, 181, 203, 225
Alting, Henricus, 7, 170–171
Alva, duke of, 187
Alverny, Marie-Thérèse d', 143
Ambrose, St., 111, 114, 140, 184, 185
Amerbach, Johannes, 203, 217
Amira, Karl von, 89
Anastasius Veluanus, 12, 13, 33, 38
Andries Jacobsz., 30, 57–58, 75
Anna, countess of East Friesland, 65
Anna Aelbrechtsdochter, 75, 76
Apeldoorn, L.J. van, 59
Aportanus, Georgius, 193
Arminius, Jacobus, 10, 12
Armstrong, A.H., 137
Assendelft, Gerrit, lord of, 49–50, 58, 82
Aston, Margaret, 150
Atkinson, W.E.D., 64, 67
Augustijn, C., 19, 33, 35, 37, 39–42, 105, 185, 187, 189, 192, 197, 198, 203
Augustine, St., 99, 102, 104, 110, 112, 127, 133, 139, 140, 141, 148, 184, 185, 206
Aurelius, Cornelis, 30, 44, 47, 48, 51–55, 74, 83, 84

Backus, Irena, 208
Baechem of Egmond, Nicolas, 48, 79
Baersdorp, Johannes van, 57
Bakhuizen van den Brink, J.N., 139
Bakhuizen van den Brink, R.C., 68
Bakker, Jan de (of Woerden), *see* Pistorius, Johannes
Balberghe, Émile van, 94, 115, 161
Bange, P., 10
Banta, Frank, 67
Barbier, Pierre, 20, 48, 167, 174
Barbosa, Augustinus, 58
Barent, Dirck, 58
Barge, Hermann, 201
Bartoš, F.M., 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 157, 158, 161
Bassevelde, Franciscus of, 162
Bauer, Karl, 206
Baum, J.W., 211
Bauwhede, Dirk van der, 162
Bavinck, H., 15
Bax, W., 217
Bazzocchi, Dino, 145
Beek, M.A., 66
Benzing, Jozef, 128, 169–170, 172, 182
Berengar of Tours, XII, 101–102, 113, 127, 137–141, 146, 147, 162, 163, 214, 220

Bergen, Ed. van, 45
Bergh, G.C.J.J. van den, 58
Bernardus ('monachus'), 8
Bernardus of Clairvaux, 88, 91, 122
Betts, R.R., 134
Beuzart, Paul, 151, 162
Beyaerts, Jean, 217
Biel, Gabriel, 91, 104, 113
Bietenholz, Peter G., 46
Bigne, Margarinus de la, 144
Bijl, S.W., 73–74
Biller, Peter, 143, 150
Billicanus, Theobald, 207
Blaas, P.B.M., 22
Blaise, Albert, 88
Blanciotti, Bonaventura, 130, 148
Blanke, Fritz, 206
Blaurer, Thomas, 5, 6
Blécourt, A. de, 47, 55
Bléharies, Jacquemart de, 155
Bloccius, Petrus, 26, 34
Blok, P.J., 22
Blom, J.C.H., 1, 36
Bockes of Ayta, Bruno, 68
Boethius, 137, 138
Bois, Simon du, 203
Bolte, Johannes, 63
Boockmann, Hartmut, 134
Boom, H. ten, 63, 188
Borchard, Martin, 151, 159
Borst, Arno, 142, 143, 145, 147
Boswell, J., 58
Bot, P.N.M., 46
Brady, Thomas A., 35
Brandt, Geraerdt, 10, 11, 16–19, 20
Brandt, Joannes, 16
Brecht, Martin, 89, 120, 206
Brenz, Johannes, 89–90
Broeckhoven, Nicolaas van, 48
Broeyer, F.G.M., 20, 73
Browe, P., 134
Brugman, Johannes, 33
Bruin, C.C. de, 20, 63, 73, 187, 190–191, 217
Bruinart, Willem, 159
Brundage, James A., 87
Brunfels, Otto, 169, 177, 179–181
Bubenheimer, Ulrich, 200
Bucer, Martin, XII, 10, 32, 89, 91, 102, 116, 128, 168, 176–178, 182, 190, 191–193, 198, 204, 208, 209, 210, 211–215, 220
Büsser, Fritz, 208, 210
Bugenhagen, Johannes, 168, 176–177, 182, 192, 205
Buijtenen, M.P. van, 63, 187
Bullinger, Heinrich, 11, 38, 209
Burke, Peter, 17
Burman, C., 30, 44, 51
But, Adrianus de, 162
Buyken, Thea, 86

Calvin, John, 10, 11, 13, 34, 38, 120, 217
Campan, Ch.-Al., 217
Campen, M. van, 192
Canirivus, Fredericus, 60, 62, 70–71, 72, 74, 80, 83, 181
Canter, Andreas, 210
Capellis, (pseudo-) Jacobo de, 145, 146
Capito, Wolfgang, 177, 191, 193, 210, 211
Carondelet, Joannes, 17
Cassander, Georg, 34
Casselius, Georgius, 214
Castro, Anthonius de, 84, 164, 199, 202
Catto, J.I., 129, 148
Cauchie, A., 154
Chadwick, Henry, 138, 139, 143
Charles IV, 133
Charles V, XI, 4, 17, 41, 42, 75, 76, 79–83, 151, 219
Charlier, Gilles, 94
Chastellain, George, 159
Chelčicky, Peter, 150
Chénon, Emile, 87
Chrisman, Miriam Usher, 180, 182
Christi, Nicolaus, 112
Christoph of Oldenburg, 3
Chrysostomus, Joannes, 204
Claesson, Gösta, 88
Clanchy, M.T., 150

Claus, Helmut, 170
Clemen, Otto, 6, 32–33, 36, 163, 187, 197, 198
Clenardus, Nicolas, 46
Clutton, George, 203
Cockshaw, Pierre, 94
Coebergh van den Braak, A.M., 26
Coing, Helmut, 59
Colster, Abel, 48
Coolhaes, Caspar, 10, 18
Cooltuyn, Cornelis, 18
Coornhert, Dirck Volkertsz., 12, 34
Coppin de Montibus, Nikolaas, 68, 82
Cornelius, St., 51–52, 55
Cornelius Thome (Thomaszoon), 47
Corver, Simon, 4, 66, 116, 197–199, 203
Cosin, John, 107
Coster, Laurens Jansz., 22
Cothen, Hermanus van, 190
Coulster, Abel, 58, 68
Courtenay, William J., 130
Cousardus, Johannes, 216
Cramer, S., 34, 152
Cratander, Andreas, 182, 202, 204
Crocus, Cornelius, 72
Cuming, G.J., 130
Cyril of Alexandria, 126

Dain, A., 225
Dalzell, Alexander, 52
Dam, Adriaen van, 77
Dam(me), Claes van, 75, 76
Dankbaar, W.F., 205, 211, 217
Dantiscus, John, 61
Dare, Jurgen von, *see* Aportanus, Georgius
David of Burgundy, bishop, 164
Decavele, Johan, 216
Deemter, R. van, 186
Dekker, Alfred M.M., 46
Dekker, C., 187
Dekkers, René, 59
Deleen, Wouter (Gualtherus), 18
Delprat, G.H.M., 26
Denck, Hans, 169, 185
Dermout, Isaäc Johannes, 21–22
Derville, Alain, 150
Dewitte, A., 162
Dieburg, Peter of, 120
Dieckhoff, August-Wilhelm, 31, 39, 125
Dionisotti, A.C., 100
Dis, Leendert Meeuwis van, 39
Doebner, Richard, 120
Doedes, J.I., 7
Doen Pietersz., 20
Dondaine, A., 142
Doornkaat Koolman, J.J. ten, 197
Dorp, Mees Hendrikszoon, 49–50
Dorpius, Martinus, 5, 18, 32, 46, 49–50, 53
Drändorf, Johannes, 151, 159
Drossaers, S.W.A., 46
Dublioul, Laurens, 82
Dufour, Alain, 11
Duifhuis, Hubert, 18
Duivenvoorde, Jan van, 68
Duke, Alastair C., 1, 17, 22, 37, 40–42, 62, 112, 146, 220
Duns Scotus, John, 99, 184
Durand of St. Pourçain, 160
Durand of Troarn, 140, 141, 142
Durand, Ursinus, 145
Durandus of Huesca, 146
Dyck, Willem Cornelisz. van, 83
Dziewicki, Michael Henry, 113

Ébrard of Béthune, 144, 146
Échard, Jacques, 161
Eck, Johannes, 208, 209
Edward I, 150
Edzard, count of East-Friesland, 194
Eecken, Peter vander, 162
Eeghen, I.H. van, 198
Eekhof, Albert, 34, 36, 51–52, 169, 170–171, 175, 186, 205, 225
Eells, Hasting, 211
Egmond, duke Charles of, 192
Elst, Claes van der, 216
Enders, Ernst Ludwig, 36, 125, 170, 175, 225
Engelen, Engelbertus van, 16

Engen, John H. van, 109, 114, 120, 141
Enno II, count of East Friesland, 66, 194, 196
Enzinas, Francisco de, 2, 19, 217
Erasmus, Desiderius, XI, 2, 3, 11, 12, 17, 18, 20, 22, 27, 30, 34, 35, 39, 40, 44, 47–50, 52, 53, 58, 59, 67, 70, 73, 74, 79, 80, 85, 91, 93, 96, 99–107, 109, 119, 124, 127, 165, 167, 173, 174, 178, 181, 186, 188, 203, 209, 210, 211, 212, 219, 226, 230, 246
Ermengaud of Béziers, 144, 145
Erven, Gillis van der, 61
Espina, Alfonso, *see* Spina, Alfonso of
Esposito, Mario, 115
Estoile, Pierre de l', 58
Eugenius III, 58
Eugenius IV, 153
Evans, Austin P., 146
Everardi, Nicolaes, 46, 49, 56, 58, 59
Eynde, Hugo van, 81

Faber, Conrad, 4
Faber, Johannes, 57
Faber, S., 57
Fantazzi, Charles, 52
Farel, Guillaume, 167, 174, 203
Farmer, David Hugh, 52, 55
Feenstra, R., 58
Feith, W.G., 46
Féret, P., 155
Ferguson, George, 88
Ferrari, Mirella, 146
Fierini, Jan, 154
Finsler, Georg, 36, 169, 171, 172, 177, 186, 205, 225
Flacius Illyricus, Matthias, 137
Flajshans, Wenzel, 128
Floure, Pierre, 152, 154
Fraet, Frans, 61
Franciscus of Assisi, 99
Franck, Sebastian, 72, 193
François I, king, 209
Frecht, Martin, 211
Fredericq, Paul, 44, 51, 60, 61, 62, 63, 65, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 75, 76, 77, 80, 81, 83, 94, 112, 141, 152, 153, 154, 155, 160, 161, 162, 189, 191
Fredrik of Baden, bishop, 62
Friedberg, Aemilius, 107, 109, 111, 112, 113, 114
Frith, John, 90–91
Froben, Johann, 203
Froschauer, Christoph, XII, 169, 176, 225
Fruin, Robert, 13, 22, 51
Fulbert of Chartres, 137
Gabbema, S.A., 61, 211
Gansfort, Wessel, 2–6, 9, 14, 22–32, 35, 39, 46, 84, 85, 89, 91, 112, 115–123, 173, 187, 197–199, 205, 213–214, 217
Ganz, Peter, 138, 142, 143, 164
Garand, Monique-Cécile, 94
García y García, Antonio, 107, 109
Geest, T.J., 64
Geisenhof, George, 168
Geldenhouwer, Gerardus, 47, 50, 68, 187, 188–190
Gelder, H.A. Enno van, 11
Gemmingen, Philip of, 214
Gentry, G., 67
Gerdes, Daniel, 7, 19–21, 24, 27, 28, 31, 36, 88, 169, 225
Gerlach, P., 31
Germanus, Martinus, 211, 214, 215
Geurts, P.A.M., 1
Ghellinck, Joseph de, 141, 142, 143
Gibson, Margaret, 149
Gieseler, Johann Carl, 25–26, 31
Gilmont, Jean-François, 94, 115, 161
Glasius, B., 29
Gnapheus, Guilielmus, 8, 9, 14, 15, 18, 20, 22, 34, 43–44, 46, 47, 55, 60, 61, 63–67, 68, 69, 72, 74, 79, 80, 82, 83, 112, 170–171, 185, 188, 189, 211
Goeters, J.F. Gerhard, 61
Goetinck, Marc, 162
Götze, Alfred, 169

Goll, Jaroslav, 150
Gonnet, Jean, 152, 162
Goswin of Halen, 2, 3, 4, 6
Gout, Arndt van der, 78
Gouw, J.L. van der, 52
Graafland, G.J., 64–65
Grafton, Anthony, 100
Grapheus, Cornelius, 17, 34, 48, 188
Gratian, 109, 111, 112, 114
Greef, W. de, 192
Gregory IX, 57, 85, 107
Gregory the Great, 184, 185
Groote, Geert, 22, 33, 120–121
Grootes, E.K., 1
Grosheide, G., 77
Grotius, Hugo, 10–12
Grundmann, Herbert, 142, 143, 150
Gualterus, *see* Wouter
Guggisberg, Hans R., 88
Guitmundus of Aversa, 113, 142, 146
Gulielmus Trajectinus, 8
Gunst, J.W., 67

Haan, J. den, 1
Haar, B. ter, 29
Haar, H.W. ter, 13
Haar, Jan Dircsz. van der, 52, 204
Häring, Nikolaus M., 143
Hätzer, Ludwig, 61, 169, 185–186
Haga, A., 198
Haitsma Mulier, E.O.G., 1
Halm, K., 170
Haméricourt, Isabelle de, 217
Hardenberg, Albert, XII, 2–6, 9, 14, 15, 18–20, 25–30, 32, 33, 50, 69, 84, 88, 115–116, 163–165, 173, 189, 196–199, 201, 218
Harder, Hans-Bernard, 133
Hardt, Hermann von der, 20–21, 27
Harmansz., Harman, 78
Harris of Upton, John, 149
Hartmann, A., 203
Harvey, Margaret, 149
Hausammann, Susi, 209
Hazlett, Ian, 211
Hedio, Kaspar, 4, 70, 202, 210, 211
Heering, G.J., 12
Hegius, Alexander, 187
Heimpel, Hermann, 151
Henry V, 153
Henry of Rees, 3
Henry of Zutphen, 19
Herbertsz, Herman, 10
Herman von Wied, 3
Hermans, Ludolf, 190
Herder, J.G., 22
Herman of Poelduinen, 45
Herminjard, A.-L., 167
Hertz, Erich, 201
Herwagen, Johann, 215
Hess, Simon, 168, 205
Heurtevent, R., 141
Heusde, Philip Willem van, 22–24, 33
Heymann, Fredrick G., 155
Hiellin, Jean of, 153
Higman, Francis, 203
Hilgenfeld, Hartmut, 133
Hoeck, Jacobus, 4, 5, 14, 32, 84, 115, 164
Hoek, C., 45
Hoen, Hendrik, 45, 163
Hoen, Henric, 45
Hoen, Jan (Johan), 45
Hoen, Margriet Willemsdochter, 45, 56, 75
Hof, J., 50
Hoffman, Melchior, XIII, 182, 192, 193, 216, 221
Hofsnider, Hendrik, 7
Hofstede de Groot, C.P., 23–24
Hofstede de Groot, P., 23–24
Holeczek, Heinz, 100
Hollander, A.A. den, 73
Hondebeke, Frederik, *see* Canirivus, Fredericus
Hoochstraten, count of, 79
Hoochstraten, Jacob of, 79
Hooft, Cornelis Pieterszoon, 11–12
Hoop Scheffer, J.G. de, 7, 8, 29–33, 37, 45, 46, 60, 62–63, 67, 75, 83, 127, 174–175, 190
Hopman, F., 117
Horace, 44, 107

Horn, Petrus, 120–121
Hospinianus, Rudolphus, 7
Hoyer, Siegfried, 180
Hudson, Anne, 130, 139, 143, 147, 148, 149, 150
Hugues of Cayen, bs. of Artois, 160
Huguet, Edmond, 58
Hugwald, Ulrich, 4, 202
Huisman, Gerda C., 116
Huizinga, Johan, 23, 24, 59, 117
Hulst, Frans van der, 41, 48, 71, 76–83, 219
Humbert of Silva Candida, cardinal, 137–138
Hunt, R.W., 137
Hurly, Michael, 149
Hus, Jan, XII, 21, 85, 128, 133–137, 147, 149, 150, 152, 153, 154, 156, 162, 163, 180, 185, 214, 220
Hutten, Ulrich of, 180
Huybregt, R., 55
Huygens, R.B.C., 137, 138, 142, 143
Hyma, A., 198

IJsewijn, J., 35, 47, 50, 59, 64, 106
Imola, Alexander de, 57
Innocent III, 107, 109, 128, 129, 130, 142, 145, 146
Innocent IV, 57

Jacob Mauritszoon, 49
Jacoba Jansd. of Woerden, 67
Jacobs, Elfriede, 203
Jacqueline of Bavaria, countess, 55
Jacquier, Nicholas, 161
Janov, Matthias of, 128, 134
Janse, Wim, 3, 69, 88
Janssen, Antoon E.M., 1, 42
Jenny, Beat Rudolf, 217
Jerome, St., 52, 58, 73, 99, 184, 185
Jodogne, Pierre, 94
John Damascene, 126
Jong-Snep, M.G.M. de, 57
Jonge, H.J. de, 100
Jorissen, Hans, 108
Jud, Leo, 63, 173, 205, 209

Kaleyser, Henry, 160
Kalveen, C.A. van, 188
Kamerling, J., 21, 22
Kaminsky, Howard, 149, 152, 155
Kamphuis, J., 186
Kan, I.B., 3
Karlstadt, Andreas, XII, XIII, 5, 25, 48, 102, 127, 128, 144, 167, 170, 180, 181, 182, 192, 198–202, 204, 206, 208, 211, 212, 213, 215, 216
Kaufmann, Thomas, 168, 176–177, 179, 186, 214
Kautz, Jacob, 169
Keller, Michael, 182
Kemp, Carel Maria van der, 22, 23
Kenny, Anthony, 129, 130
Kessler, E., 64
Kist, N.C., 24–29, 31, 33
Klapisch-Zuber, Christiane, 87
Knappert, L., 24, 36–37, 38, 60
Knobloch, Johann, XII, 170, 172, 204, 225
Koch, Ernst, 193–194
Köhler, Hans-Joachim, 180
Köhler, Walther, 7, 36, 49, 169, 171, 173–174, 175, 182, 186, 205, 206, 208
Köpfel, Wolfgang, 182
Kolb, Franz, 200
Kolde, Theodor, 31, 32
Kooiman, W.J., 66, 186
Kooloos, W.A., 45
Koster-van Dijk, J.M.I., 57
Krafft, Karl, 64, 210
Krafft, Wilhelm, 64, 210
Krautwald, Valentin, 207
Kraye, Jill, 100
Krebs, Martin, 180
Kretzmann, Norman, 130
Krieger, Christian, 177
Krodel, Gottfried G., 88
Kronenberg, M.E., 52, 198, 199
Krüger, Friedhelm, 91
Kühler, W.J., 38, 120
Kükenbieter, Joachim, 196–197
Kuttner, Stephan, 109

Kuyper, A., 36
Kuyper, H.H., 36

Lacaze, Yvon, 160
Lambert, Malcolm, 134, 142
Lameere, J., 76
Landgraf, Artur Michael, 146
Landschad von Steinach, Johannes, 168, 213, 214
Lanfranc of Bec, 113, 127, 137–140, 143
Lang, August, 211
Langerak, Gijsbert van, *see* Longolius, Gisbertus
Lasco, Johannes a, 13, 34, 61, 65, 211
Lauwerijns, Joost, 68, 79
Lavater, Ludovicus, 6, 14, 15, 20, 26, 28, 206
Lechler, Gotthard, 113, 128
Leclercq, J., 88
Leendertz, W., 66
Lem, G.A.C. van der, 1
Lens, Philippus de, 18
Leo X, pope, 73, 81
Lerner, Robert E., 152, 162
Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim, 137
Lettersnyder, Cornelis Heynricz., 52, 73
Lewis, C.S., XIII
Leyenhorst, C.G. van, 46
Liebeschütz, H., 137
Liebs, Detlef, 58
Lienhard, Marc, 177
Linck, Wenzeslau, 180
Lindeboom, J., 24, 34, 35–36, 37, 63
Linden, H. van der, 57
Lippius, Johannes, 190
Listrius, Gerardus, 34, 112, 125, 198, 202, 203, 210, 211
Livet, Georges, 179
Loeb, Isidore, 115
Loeff, G.C.M., 16, 17
Loewenich, Walther von, 66
Lombardus, Petrus, 104, 109, 113, 114, 115
Long, Isaäc le, 20
Longolius, Gisbertus, 190
Loo, Albert van, 81
Loosjes, J., 38
Looz-Corswarem, Clemens von, 210, 211
Loserth, Johann, 127, 128, 132, 134
Lotter, Melchior, 198
Lourdaux, W., 188
Loyseleur de Villiers, Pierre, 19
Lubac, Henri de, 141
Lucia, St., 54–55
Lucinius, 52
Luther, Johannes, 169
Luther, Martin, XI, XII, XIII, 4–6, 8–9, 12–14, 18, 20, 22, 25, 27, 31, 32, 37–40, 49–51, 53–54, 62, 66, 73, 74, 81, 85, 102, 112, 123–127, 128, 165, 173, 174, 178, 180, 181, 182, 185, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 198–202, 207, 209, 210, 212, 213, 214, 215, 219, 221, 225
Lydius, Johannes, 190

MacDonald, A. J, 138
Macy, Gary, 108, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146
Mainard, Catherine, 154
Man, Meinard, 49–50
Margaret of Austria, 44, 47, 51, 68, 71, 75, 79–83, 211
Margolin, Jean-Claude, 179
Margry, P.J., 50
Marnix, Philip of, 88
Martène, Edmundus, 145
Martin V, pope, 151, 155
Mary, St., 40, 93, 94, 132, 136
Masai, F., 94
Mattheus, A., 71
Mau, Rudolf, 126
Maximilian I, 47, 77, 162
Meier, Ludger, 134
Meijers, E., 47, 55
Meiners, Eduard, 193, 195
Melanchthon, Philippus, 2, 5, 6, 11, 61, 74
Mersault, Gilles, 152, 154–159
Merula, Angelus, 18, 33, 34
Metsys, Quinten, 59

Meyer, J. Ch., 177
Meyer, W., 170
Meyers, Johanna J.M., 99
Micron, Marten, 34, 196–197
Milde, Wolfgang, 137
Milíc of Kremsier, Jan, 134
Miller, G., 11
Minderaa, P., 63
Misset, C.J., 1, 36
Moeller, Bernd, 210
Molhuysen, P.C., 51, 53
Molin, Jean-Baptiste, 87
Moll, Willem, 29, 30, 32, 33, 153, 189
Molnár, Amedeo, 147, 152, 162
Mondicenus, Gerardus, 190
Moneta of Cremona, 144, 145
Montclos, Jean de, 113, 127, 137, 138, 140
Montijn, G., 29
Moolenbroek, Jaap van, 116
More, Thomas, 90–91
Mori, Gustav, 169
Mosheim, Johann Lorenz, 19
Mostert, M., 50
Mout, M.E.H.N., 151
Mouwijck, Gerard van, *see* Mondicenus, Gerardus
Müller, E.F. Karl, 193, 194
Müller, Joseph, 150
Muller, Jean, 170, 182
Munssoor, Leonardus, 192
Munting, W.N., 25
Musculus, Wolfgang, 88
Mutembe, Protais, 87
Muurling, W., 23

Nannius, Petrus, 18, 72
Nauta, D., 1, 29
Neander, August, 127
Nellen, H.J.M., 10
Nerdenus, Henricus Antonides, 7–8, 13, 18, 19, 31
Netter of Walden, Thomas, 130, 139, 148–149
Neumann, Augustin, 152
Nicholas 'the Abbot', 162
Nicholas of Pilgram, 149
Nierop, H.F.K. van, 50
Niewöhner, Friedrich, 138, 142, 143
Nippold, Friedrich, 31
Nissen, Peter J.A., 41–42
Nossiophagus, Joachim, *see* Kükenbieter, Joachim
Nyhus, Paul L., 186

O'Rourke Boyle, Marjorie, 48
Oberman, Heiko A., 27, 35, 91, 119–120, 170, 175, 176, 186
Ockham, William of, 130
Odo Caeracensis, 110
Oecolampadius, Johannes, XII, 5, 6, 8, 26, 31, 32, 49, 89, 102, 116, 128, 168, 173, 177, 178, 180, 182, 185, 198, 202–204, 207, 208, 213, 214, 216
Oem van Wyngaerden, Floris, 75, 76–82
Oorthuys, G., 38
Oostendorp, Johannes, 187, 190
Oosterbaan, D.P., 8, 63, 70, 71, 151
Oporinus, Ioannes, 72
Origen, 126
Otman, Silvan, 185
Otter of Neckarsteinach, Jacob, 168, 176, 213, 214
Oudaen, Joachim, 17
Ozment, Steven, 120

Pabon, N.J., 45
Pafraet, Albert, 190
Pantin, W.A., 137
Paolini, Lorenzo, 143
Paschasius Radbertus, 137–138
Patchovsky, Alexander, 142, 150
Pater, Calvin Augustine, 216
Paul, St., 39, 49, 54, 73, 93–95, 148, 156, 157, 158, 185
Paul IV, pope, 216
Payn, Patricia, 100
Payne, John B., 105
Pegel, R.H., 188
Pegg, Michael A., 128, 169–170, 180, 182, 204

Pellikan, Konrad, 180
Pelt, Johan, 20, 194
Pennington, Kenneth, 109
Penon, Georg, 17
Peschke, Erhard, 150
Peterssen, Rem, 204
Petri, Adam, 4, 6, 190–191, 202–203
Petri, F., 210
Pettegree, Andrew, 61
Philip of Burgundy, bishop, 188–189
Philip II of Spain, 40, 151
Philip the Good, of Burgundy, 55, 77, 153, 159–161, 162
Phlon, Jacquemart le, 159
Pierre of Poitiers, 145
Pignon, Laurens, 160
Pijper, Frederik, 12, 33–35, 39, 66, 152
Pinborg, Jan, 130
Pistorius, Johannes, 8, 9, 18, 20, 22, 60, 61, 67–70, 72, 74, 79, 163, 185, 188, 198
Planitz, Hans, 86
Pol, F. van der, 10
Pollet, J.V., 192, 211
Pont, J.W., 24, 38, 190
Poree, Martin, 154
Porphyrius, 138
Post, R.R., 46, 154, 188
Posthumus Meyjes, G.H.M., 10, 13
Postma, Folkert, 47
Poullain, Valérand, 217
Powicke, Frederick Maurice, 137
Prague, Jerome of, 134
Pret, Pierre du, 152–153
Preus, James S., 127
Prinsen, J., Jlz., 47
Pupper of Goch, Johan, 27

Quétif, Jacques, 161
Quinet, Edgar, 88

Raa, C.M.G. ten, 59
Rabbie, E., 10, 12
Rabenau, Konrad von, 66
Rabil, Albert, 59
Rapp, Francis, 179
Ratramnus of Corbie, 137, 139
Raynaud de Lage, G., 143
Reedijk, C., 105
Reekamp, Johannes, 2
Reese, Heinrich von, 193
Reeve, Anne, 100
Regenboog, Jacobus, 12
Reidt, von, family, 210
Reinhart, Martin, 182, 201
Reitsma, J., 63
Reuchlin, Johannes, 3, 21
Reusch, Franz Heinrich, 216
Revius, Jacobus, 61, 69
Reyniers, Gertrude, 122
Rhegius, Urbanus, 207
Rhijn, Maarten van, 2, 3, 8, 33, 39, 84, 118–120, 165, 187
Rhodius, Franciscus, 43
Ricchinius, Thomas Augustinus, 144
Rigenus, Georgius, 190
Rinck, family, 210
Ritter, François, 169
Rochais, H., 88
Rode (R[h]odius), Hinne [Henricus], XII, 5, 6, 8, 9, 14, 18, 20, 27, 31, 32, 36, 38, 46, 60, 63, 67, 70, 101, 116, 163–165, 171, 172, 173, 178, 179, 181, 186, 187–218, 220
Roe, Zeger van, 162
Roelevink, J., 22
Roersch, Alphonse, 46
Rompaey, J. van, 83
Roodhuyzen, Hendrik, 64
Roovere, Paul de, 216–217
Rosa, Jan, 47
Rosemond, Godschalck, 68
Rothe, Hans, 134
Rott, Hans-Georg, 180
Rott, Jean, 168, 179, 209, 211, 214
Royaards, Herman Johannes, 24
Rubin, Miri, 88, 148
Ruë, Pierre de la, 20
Rückert, Hanns, 206
Rummel, Erika, 48, 107
Rupert of Deutz, 114
Rupp, Gordon, 201

Rusch, Adolph, 127
Russel, Paul, 178
Rutgers, F.L., 36
Ruusbroeck, Jan van, 22
Ryba, Bohumil, 136
Ryss, Konrad, 176–177

Saganus, Georgius, 6, 14, 20, 32, 63, 171, 192, 205, 207
Sagarus, Gulielmus, 20
Sandelijn, Arnout, 30, 75
Santbergen, R. van, 217
Santing, C.G., 3
Sartorius, Johannes, 8, 9, 60, 61, 62, 72–73, 193
Sasbout, Joost, 58
Saxoferrato, Bartolus de, 57
Schäfer, Gerhard, 89
Schalling, Martin, 214
Schamschula, Walther, 136
Scheltema, P., 58
Schelven, A.A. van, 217
Schepper, H. de, 55, 57
Schindling, Anton, 42
Schmid, Alois, 47
Schmidt, Charles, 172
Schoeck, Richard J., 52
Schöffer, Peter, XII, 128, 169, 170, 177, 181, 185, 2225
Schoockius, Martinus, 8–9, 19, 22, 62, 63, 189
Schottenloher, Karl, 182, 185
Schuldorp, Marquard, 216
Schwenckfeld, Kaspar, 207
Scotus Eriugena, John, 137
Screech, Michael A., 100
Scribner, R.W., 210, 211
Scultetus, Abraham, 70
Secundus, Janus, 46
Sehling, Emil, 193, 194, 195
Seibt, Ferdinand, 133, 151
Selge, Kurt-Victor, 146, 151
Sepp, Christiaan, 1, 8, 19, 21, 187
Sernee, J.M., 46
Serrurier, Nicolas, 154
Sieveke, Günther, 64
Sigismund, Emperor, 153, 155
Simons of Delft, Joannes, 30, 46
Sleenbusz, Antonius, 197
Šmahel, F., 134
Smalley, Beryl, 129
Smend, Julius, 204
Smid, Menno, 193
Smidt, J. Th. de, 57, 83
Smith, Lesley, 149
Socas, Franciscus, 2, 217
Sonderdanck, Willem, 76, 78, 82
Sousedik, Stanislav, 147
Southern, R.W., 137, 207
Spalatin, Georg, 180
Spiljardus, Johannes, 15, 186
Spina, Alfonso of, 114–115
Splinter, Jan, 82
Spruit, J.E., 58
Spruyt, B.J., 10, 13, 63, 112, 116, 120, 125, 151, 187, 188, 192, 198, 203, 211, 217
Stadion, Christoph von, bishop, 185
Staedtke, Joachim, 120
Staehelin, Ernst, 202, 204
Staphylus, Fredericus, 65
Steitz, Georg Eduard, 211
Stephanus Augustinensis, 110
Sterk, J., 188, 189
Stitny, Thomas of, 134
Stock, Brian, 150
Stratenwerth, Heide, 75
Streefkerk, C., 57
Sylvanus, Georgius, 8, 9, 62, 63

Tabor, Otto, 58
Tamse, C.A., 17, 22
Tanis, James, 193
Tapper, Ruardus, 68
Tauler, Johannes, 22
Tertullian, 87–88, 207, 214
Thoisy, Jan of, 154
Thomas Aquinas, St., 93, 99–102, 106, 109, 110, 111, 114, 115, 131, 184, 227, 243
Thomson, Williel R., 128, 134, 180
Thysius, Antonius, 15

Til, Salomon van, 20
Tilmans, Karin, 44, 47, 51–53
Timann, Johann, 3, 88, 194
Tongerloo, L. van, 188
Toorenenbergen, J.J. van, 112, 196, 204
Toriel, Jacquemart, 159
Totani, Guilelmus, 115
Toussain, Pierre, 167, 174
Toussaint, J., 160
Tracy, James D., 41, 58, 83
Trapman, J., 10, 31, 34, 37, 39, 41, 42, 64, 65, 72–73, 100, 101, 103, 104, 106, 125, 127, 174, 183, 193, 194, 204, 216, 217, 226
Trigland, Jacobus, 11, 13–15, 18, 19, 20, 186
Troeltsch, Ernst, 39
Troje, Hans Erich, 59
Tschackert, Paul, 64
Tudeschis, Nicolas de, 57
Turnau, Peter, 151
Tyndale, William, 169

Ulhart, Philipp, 182, 185
Ullmann, Carl, 24–28, 30–31, 39
Ursinus, Zacharias, 15, 186
Utenhove, Johannes, 34
Uytven, R. van, 217

Vadianus, Joachim, 169, 209
Valkema Blouw, Paul, 61, 62, 217
Valla, Lorenzo, 21
Vanderjagt, A.J., 116, 160
Vasoli, Cesare, 143
Velden, H.E.J.M. van der, 3
Verdam, J., 58
Verhoeven, G., 62–63
Vervaart, Otto D.M.F., 56
Verwey, Jacob, 61
Verwijs, E., 58
Viglius ab Ayta, 34, 46–47
Vis, G.N.M., 50
Visser, Derk, 88, 206
Vivart, Thomas, 152
Vocht, Henry de, 44, 46, 61, 84
Volcardus, Jacobus, 46
Voldersgraft, Willem Claesz. van de *see* Gnapheus, Guilielmus
Voolstra, S., 118
Vorsterman, Willem, 204
Voskuil, J.J., 87
Vree, J., 23, 24
Vreese, Willem de, 68
Vriemoet, E.L., 7
Vrugt, M. van de, 58
Vulcanius, Bonaventura, 52

Wailes, Stephen L., 67
Wakefield, Walter L., 146
Waldhauser, Konrad, 133
Walsh, Katherine, 129
Ward, Benedicta, 149
Weber, Robertus, 104
Wedekind, W.G. Ph. E., 55, 77
Weidensee, Eberhard, 216
Weiler, A.G., 189
Weiss, James Michael, 3
Weiss, N., 203
Werner, Ernst, 133, 151
Westerburg, Gerard, 180, 211
Westphal, Joachim, 206
Whatmore, L.E., 91
Wiggertsz, Herman, 10
Wijffels, Alain, 56, 57, 59
Wijnssen, Jakob van, 190
Wilks, Michael, 130
William VIII of Montpellier, count, 143
William of Orange, 10
Williams, George H., 88, 119
Wils, Jos., 47
Wimpfeling, Jacobus, 203
Winter, Eduard, 133
Witteveen, K.M., 7, 19, 20
Wittmer, Ch., 177
Witzendorf, Hieronymus, 196
Wolf, Frieda, 89
Wolff, Thomas, 203
Wolfs, S.P., 63, 165, 203
Woltjer, J.J., 37–38
Wood, Diana, 129
Woodford, William, 148, 149
Workman, Herbert B., 129

Wormerus, Gerardus, 8
Wouter, 30, 37, 62–63, 198
Wtenbogaert, Johannes, 11, 12–13, 19, 34
Wullenwever, Jürgen, 196
Wyclif, John, XII, 21, 85, 108, 113, 126, 127–133, 134, 136, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 147–149, 150, 153, 154, 162, 163, 169, 177, 179–180, 206, 213, 214, 220
Wyss, Bernhard, 205
Wyttenbach, Thomas, 205
Ypey, Annaeus, 21–22
Zasius, Ulrich, 58
Ziegler, Walter, 42
Zijlstra, S., 37
Zizka of Trocnov, Jan, 151, 160
Zorzin, Alejandro, 170, 180, 201
Zuerius van Boxhorn, Marcus, 151
Zwingli, Ulrich, XI, XII, 5, 6, 8, 13, 14, 19, 20, 25, 26–29, 31, 32, 36, 37, 42, 49, 63, 91, 113, 116, 119, 167, 169, 170, 171, 173, 174, 175, 176, 182, 191, 193, 194, 198, 199, 205–210, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 220

STUDIES IN MEDIEVAL AND REFORMATION TRADITIONS

(*Formerly Studies in Medieval and Reformation Thought*)

Founded by Heiko A. Oberman†
Edited by Andrew Colin Gow

64. ROBBINS, K.C. *City on the Ocean Sea: La Rochelle, 1530-1650.* Urban Society, Religion, and Politics on the French Atlantic Frontier. 1997
65. BLICKLE, P. *From the Communal Reformation to the Revolution of the Common Man.* 1998
66. FELMBERG, B.A.R. *Die Ablaßtheorie Kardinal Cajetans (1469-1534).* 1998
67. CUNEO, P.F. *Art and Politics in Early Modern Germany.* Jörg Breu the Elder and the Fashioning of Political Identity, ca. 1475-1536. 1998
68. BRADY, Jr., Th.A. *Communities, Politics, and Reformation in Early Modern Europe.* 1998
69. McKEE, E.A. *The Writings of Katharina Schütz Zell.* 1. The Life and Thought of a Sixteenth-Century Reformer. 2. A Critical Edition. 1998
70. BOSTICK, C.V. *The Antichrist and the Lollards.* Apocalyticism in Late Medieval and Reformation England. 1998
71. BOYLE, M. O'ROURKE. *Senses of Touch.* Human Dignity and Deformity from Michelangelo to Calvin. 1998
72. TYLER, J.J. *Lord of the Sacred City*. The *Episcopus Exclusus* in Late Medieval and Early Modern Germany. 1999
74. WITT, R.G. *'In the Footsteps of the Ancients'*. The Origins of Humanism from Lovato to Bruni. 2000
77. TAYLOR, L.J. *Heresy and Orthodoxy in Sixteenth-Century Paris*. François le Picart and the Beginnings of the Catholic Reformation. 1999
78. BUCER, M. *Briefwechsel/Correspondance*. Band IV (Januar-September 1530). Herausgegeben und bearbeitet von R. Friedrich, B. Hamm und A. Puchta. 2000
79. MANETSCH, S.M. *Theodore Beza and the Quest for Peace in France, 1572-1598.* 2000
80. GODMAN, P. *The Saint as Censor.* Robert Bellarmine between Inquisition and Index. 2000
81. SCRIBNER, R.W. *Religion and Culture in Germany (1400-1800).* Ed. L. Roper. 2001
82. KOOI, C. *Liberty and Religion.* Church and State in Leiden's Reformation, 1572-1620. 2000
83. BUCER, M. *Opera Latina.* Vol. V. Defensio adversus axioma catholicum id est criminationem R.P. Roberti Episcopi Abrincensis (1534). Ed. W.I.P. Hazlett. 2000
84. BOER, W. DE. *The Conquest of the Soul.* Confession, Discipline, and Public Order in Counter-Reformation Milan. 2001
85. EHRSTINE, G. *Theater, culture, and community in Reformation Bern, 1523-1555.* 2001
86. CATTERALL, D. *Community Without Borders.* Scot Migrants and the Changing Face of Power in the Dutch Republic, c. 1600-1700. 2002
87. BOWD, S.D. *Reform Before the Reformation.* Vincenzo Querini and the Religious Renaissance in Italy. 2002
88. PELC, M. *Illustrium Imagines*. Das Porträtbuch der Renaissance. 2002
89. SAAK, E.L. *High Way to Heaven.* The Augustinian Platform between Reform and Reformation, 1292-1524. 2002
90. WITTNEBEN, E.L. *Bonagratia von Bergamo*, Franziskanerjurist und Wortführer seines Ordens im Streit mit Papst Johannes XXII. 2003
91. ZIKA, C. *Exorcising our Demons,* Magic, Witchcraft and Visual Culture in Early Modern Europe. 2002
92. MATTOX, M.L. "*Defender of the Most Holy Matriarchs*", Martin Luther's Interpretation of the Women of Genesis in the *Enarrationes in Genesin*, 1535-45. 2003

93. LANGHOLM, O. *The Merchant in the Confessional,* Trade and Price in the Pre-Reformation Penitential Handbooks. 2003
94. BACKUS, I. *Historical Method and Confessional Identity in the Era of the Reformation (1378-1615)*. 2003
95. FOGGIE, J.P. *Renaissance Religion in Urban Scotland.* The Dominican Order, 1450-1560. 2003
96. LÖWE, J.A. *Richard Smyth and the Language of Orthodoxy.* Re-imagining Tudor Catholic Polemicism. 2003
97. HERWAARDEN, J. VAN. *Between Saint James and Erasmus.* Studies in Late-Medieval Religious Life: Devotion and Pilgrimage in The Netherlands. 2003
98. PETRY, Y. *Gender, Kabbalah and the Reformation.* The Mystical Theology of Guillaume Postel (1510–1581). 2004
99. EISERMANN, F., SCHLOTHEUBER, E. und HONEMANN, V. *Studien und Texte zur literarischen und materiellen Kultur der Frauenklöster im späten Mittelalter*. Ergebnisse eines Arbeitsgesprächs in der Herzog August Bibliothek Wolfenbüttel, 24.-26. Febr. 1999. 2004
100. WITCOMBE, C.L.C.E. *Copyright in the Renaissance*. Prints and the *Privilegio* in Sixteenth-Century Venice and Rome. 2004
101. BUCER, M. *Briefwechsel/Correspondance.* Band V (September 1530-Mai 1531). Herausgegeben und bearbeitet von R. Friedrich, B. Hamm, A. Puchta und R. Liebenberg. 2004
102. MALONE, C.M. *Façade as Spectacle: Ritual and Ideology at Wells Cathedral*. 2004
103. KAUFHOLD, M. (ed.) *Politische Reflexion in der Welt des späten Mittelalters / Political Thought in the Age of Scholasticism*. Essays in Honour of Jürgen Miethke. 2004
104. BLICK, S. and TEKIPPE, R. (eds.). *Art and Architecture of Late Medieval Pilgrimage in Northern Europe and the British Isles*. 2004
105. PASCOE, L.B., S.J. *Church and Reform.* Bishops, Theologians, and Canon Lawyers in the Thought of Pierre d'Ailly (1351-1420). 2005
106. SCOTT, T. *Town, Country, and Regions in Reformation Germany*. 2005
107. GROSJEAN, A.N.L. and MURDOCH, S. (eds.). *Scottish Communities Abroad in the Early Modern Period*. 2005
108. POSSET, F. *Renaissance Monks*. Monastic Humanism in Six Biographical Sketches. 2005
109. IHALAINEN, P. *Protestant Nations Redefined*. Changing Perceptions of National Identity in the Rhetoric of the English, Dutch and Swedish Public Churches, 1685-1772. 2005
110. FURDELL, E. (ed.) *Textual Healing: Essays on Medieval and Early Modern Medicine*. 2005
111. ESTES, J.M. *Peace, Order and the Glory of God.* Secular Authority and the Church in the Thought of Luther and Melanchthon, 1518-1559. 2005
112. MÄKINEN, V. (ed.) *Lutheran Reformation and the Law.* 2006
113. STILLMAN, R.E. (ed.) *Spectacle and Public Performance in the Late Middle Ages and the Renaissance.* 2006
114. OCKER, C. *Church Robbers and Reformers in Germany, 1525-1547*. Confiscation and Religious Purpose in the Holy Roman Empire. 2006
115. ROECK, B. *Civic Culture and Everyday Life in Early Modern Germany*. 2006
116. BLACK, C. Pico's Heptaplus and Biblical Hermeneutics. 2006
117. BLAŽEK, P. *Die mittelalterliche Rezeption der aristotelischen Philosophie der Ehe*. Von Robert Grosseteste bis Bartholomäus von Brügge (1246/1247-1309). 2006
118. AUDISIO, G. Translated by C. Davison. *Preachers by Night*. The Waldensian Barbes (15th-16th Centuries). 2006
119. SPRUYT, B.J. *Cornelius Henrici Hoen (Honius) and his Epistle on the Eucharist (1525)*. Medieval Heresy, Erasmian Humanism, and Reform in the Early Sixteenth-Century Low Countries. 2006
120. BUCER, M. *Briefwechsel/Correspondance.* Band VI (Mai-Oktober 1531). Herausgegeben und bearbeitet von R. Friedrich, B. Hamm, W. Simon und M. Arnold. 2006